arXiv:1407.6686v3 [math.AP] 3 Jan 2016

A GLOBAL DEFINITION OF QUASINORMAL MODES FOR KERR–ADS BLACK HOLES

ORAN GANNOT

Abstract. The quasinormal frequencies of massive scalar fields on Kerr–AdS black holes are identified with poles of a certain meromorphic family of operators, once boundary conditions are specified at the conformal boundary. Consequently, the quasinormal frequencies form a discrete subset of the complex plane and the corresponding poles are of finite rank. This result holds for a broad class of elliptic boundary conditions, with no restrictions on the rotation speed of the black hole.

1. Introduction

The study of quasinormal modes (QNMs) has proven useful in understanding long-time behavior of linearized perturbations throughout general relativity. These modes are solutions of the linear wave equation with harmonic time-dependence, subject to outgoing boundary conditions at event horizons. Associated to each QNM is a complex quasinormal frequency (QNF) which determines the time evolution of a QNM: the real part describes the mode of oscillation, while the imaginary part corresponds to exponential decay or growth in time.

The QNF spectrum depends on black hole parameters (such as cosmological constant, rotation speed, and mass), but not the precise nature of the perturbation. The distribution of QNFs in the complex plane is expected to dictate the return to equilibrium for linearized perturbations. This follows established tradition in scattering theory, where QNFs typically go by the name of scattering poles or resonances.

In particular, there has been a great deal of interest in the QNMs of asymptotically anti-de Sitter (AdS) black holes, motivated both by developments in the AdS/CFT program and by closely related questions in classical gravitation [27, 37, 47]. Understanding perturbations of such black holes is a common thread in both the physics and mathematics literature.

According to the proposed holographic correspondence, a black hole in an AdS background is dual to a thermal state on the conformal boundary. Behavior of perturbations in the bulk therefore yields predictions on thermalization timescales for the dual gauge theory which are difficult to calculate within the strongly coupled field theory. It is also important to note that QNMs have a distinguished interpretation in the AdS/CFT correspondence [13, 35].

Additionally, a major unsolved problem in mathematical general relativity is the nonlinear instability of global anti-de Sitter space, in the sense that a generic perturbation of such a metric will grow and form a black hole [4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 15]. If AdS is indeed unstable, a natural question is whether the endpoint of instability for global AdS is a Kerr–AdS black hole. Both of these subjects have motivated substantial interest in the nonlinear instability (or stability) of Kerr–AdS [13, 14, 15, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33]. In particular, Holzegel–Smulevici established logarithmic decay of massive scalar waves on Kerr–AdS backgrounds [30] (with Dirichlet conditions imposed at the conformal boundary), and then demonstrated the optimality of this decay rate [32] (see also [22] for the Schwarzschild–AdS case). This slow decay rate lead to the conjecture that Kerr–AdS itself is nonlineary unstable.

This paper studies the particular case of scalar perturbations of Kerr–AdS black holes. The relevant linear equation to be solved is the Klein–Gordon equation

$$(\Box_g + \nu^2 - 9/4)\phi = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{M}_+, \tag{1.1}$$

where $(\mathcal{M}_+, g)$ is the exterior of a Kerr–AdS black hole, and ν is an effective mass parameter which in appropriate units satisfies the Breitenlohner–Freedman unitarity bound $\nu > 0$.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a robust definition of QNFs for Kerr–AdS metrics which does not depend on any extra symmetries (separation of variables), and then show that the QNF spectrum forms a discrete subset of the complex plane. This means studying solutions to (1.1) of the form $\phi = e^{-i\lambda t}u$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and u is a function on the time slice $\{t = 0\}$ (here t is a time coordinate which is regular across the event horizon). The critical observation is that the outgoing condition is equivalent to a certain smoothness requirement for u at the event horizon.

Since the conformal boundary on an asymptotically AdS spacetime is timelike, there is no reason for the set of QNFs to be discrete unless (1.1) is augmented by boundary conditions at the conformal boundary. Choosing appropriate boundary conditions is a subtle point, depending on the effective mass ν. When $\nu \geq 1$, it suffices to rule out solutions which grow too rapidly near the conformal boundary. On the other hand, when $0 < \nu < 1$ the problem is underdetermined and boundary conditions must be imposed.

This paper uses recent advances in the microlocal study of wave equations on black hole backgrounds due to Vasy [42] to study global Fredholm properties of the time-independent problem. Upon verifying some dynamical assumptions on the null-geodesic flow of Kerr–AdS metrics, the approach of [42] provides certain estimates for the spectral family corresponding to (1.1), at least away from the conformal boundary. Compared to recent work of Warnick [46] on QNFs of AdS black hole, there is

no restriction on the rotation speed of the black — see Section 1.2 below for more information about the differences between [46] and this paper.

In Sections 2.3, 5.2, a theory of boundary value problems for some singular elliptic operators, developed in [23], is reviewed. This theory applies in the Kerr–AdS setting. Provided the boundary conditions satisfy a type of Lopatinskiĭ condition when $0 < \nu < 1$, the results of [23] provide elliptic estimates near the boundary — see Section 5.2 for more details. These boundary conditions account for the majority of those considered in the physics literature [1, 5, 10, 11, 16, 36, 48]. This substantially generalizes the self-adjoint Dirichlet or Robin boundary conditions considered in [46]. In particular, certain time-periodic boundary conditions are admissible.

Combining estimates near the boundary with those in the interior suffices to prove the Fredholm property for the stationary operator. The inverse of this operator forms a meromorphic family, and QNFs are then defined as poles of that family, with (finite) multiplicities given by the ranks of residues.

A simplified discussion of Vasy's method in the slightly less involved asymptotically hyperbolic setting can found in [20], although the approach to proving meromorphy there differs from that of this paper (which is closer to [42].)

1.1. **Main results.** For notation, the reader is referred to Section 3. Let $\mathcal{M}_+$ denote the exterior of a Kerr–AdS spacetime with metric g, determined by parameters (Λ, a, M). It is convenient to use units in which $|\Lambda| = 3$. After modifying the time slicing (originally defined via Boyer–Lindquist coordinates), there always exists an extension of g across the event horizon to a larger spacetime $\mathcal{M}$, such that the time slice $X = \{t = 0\}$ is spacelike. In the exact Kerr–AdS setting g has a distinguished real analytic extension, but only the spacelike nature of X is used in the subsequent analysis.

The stationary Klein–Gordon operator $P(\lambda)$ is defined on X by replacing D_t with a spectral parameter $-\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ in the operator $\varrho^2(\Box_g + \nu^2 - 9/4)$. The prefactor ϱ^2 (defined in Section 3) appears naturally when formulating energy identities for (1.1) (see [45, 46]), and does not affect solutions to the homogeneous equation $P(\lambda)u = 0$. The finite energy solutions as measured by the energy-momentum tensor lie in $\mathcal{H}^0(X) := sL^2(X)$, where $L^2(X)$ is defined with respect to any smooth density on the compactification $\overline{X}$ (see Section 3.3) and s is a boundary defining function for the conformal boundary Y.

The effective mass is required to satisfy the Breintenlohner–Freedman bound $\nu > 0$. This restriction has a variety of consequences for the study of massive waves on asymptotically AdS spaces; in this paper, the bound must be satisfied in order to apply the results of [23] on certain singular elliptic boundary value problems.

Given $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{H}^1(X)$ denote the space of all $u \in \mathcal{H}^0(X)$ such that the conjugated derivative $s^{\nu-3/2}d(s^{3/2-\nu}u)$ lies in $\mathcal{H}^0(X)$ (where the magnitude of a covector is measured by a smooth inner product on $T^*\overline{X}$). Given $s = 0, 1$, let $\mathcal{H}^{s,k}(X)$ denote the space of all $u \in \mathcal{H}^s(X)$ such that $V_1 \cdots V_N u \in \mathcal{H}^s(X)$, where $V_1, \dots, V_N$ is any collection of at most k vector fields on $\overline{X}$ which are tangent to Y. Finally, set

$$\mathcal{X}^k = \{u \in \mathcal{H}^{1,k}(X) : P(0)u \in \mathcal{H}^{0,k}(X)\}.$$

It is required that $\mathcal{M}_+$ is a nonextremal black hole, in which case the surface gravity κ associated to the event horizon is positive. Explicitly,

$$\kappa = \frac{\partial_r \Delta_r(r_+)}{2(1-\alpha)(r_+^2 + a^2)}.$$

The first result, valid for $\nu \geq 1$, is the following.

Theorem 1. *If $\nu \geq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$P(\lambda) : \mathcal{X}^k \to \mathcal{H}^{0,k}(X)$$

is Fredholm for λ in the half-plane $\{\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \kappa(1/2 + k)\}$. Furthermore, given any angular sector $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ in the upper half-plane, there exists $R > 0$ such that $P(\lambda)$ is invertible for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $|\lambda| > R$.

By analytic Fredholm theory, the family $\lambda \mapsto P(\lambda)^{-1}$ is meromorphic. QNFs in the half-plane $\{\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \kappa(1/2 + k)\}$ are defined as poles of $P(\lambda)^{-1} : \mathcal{H}^{0,k}(X) \to \mathcal{X}^k$. The poles are discrete and the corresponding residues are finite rank operators. Furthermore, any element u in the kernel of $P(\lambda) : \mathcal{X}^k \to \mathcal{H}^{0,k}(X)$ is smooth up to the artificial boundary H provided the threshhold condition $\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \kappa(1/2 + k)$ is satisfied, and u has a conormal asymptotic expansion at Y [23, Proposition 4.17].

The analogous statement when $0 < \nu < 1$ is more involved since boundary conditions (in the sense of Bessel operators, see Section 2.3.3) must be imposed at the conformal boundary Y to obtain a Fredholm problem. Fix a weighted trace $T(\lambda)$ whose 'principal part' is independent of λ and let

$$\mathscr{P}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} P(\lambda) \\ T(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The trace operator $T(\lambda)$ has an 'order' μ (which depends on ν) such that a priori

$$T(\lambda) : \mathcal{X}^k \to H^{k+1-\mu}(Y)$$

is bounded. The operator $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ is required to satisfy the parameter-dependent Lopatinskiĭ condition (again in the sense of Bessel operators, see 2.3.4) with respect to an angular sector $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ in the upper half-plane.

Theorem 2. *If $0 < \nu < 1, k \in \mathbb{N}$, and μ is the order of $T(\lambda)$ with respect to ν, then*

$$\mathscr{P}(\lambda) : \{u \in \mathcal{X}^k : T(0)u \in H^{k+2-\mu}(Y)\} \to \mathcal{H}^{0,k}(X) \times H^{k+2-\mu}(Y)$$

is Fredholm for λ in the half-plane $\{\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \kappa(1/2 + k)\}$. Furthermore, there exists $R > 0$ such that $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ is invertible for $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $|\lambda| > R$.

QNFs in the half-plane $\{\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \kappa(1/2 + k)\}$ are again defined as poles of the meromorphic family $\lambda \mapsto \mathscr{P}(\lambda)^{-1}$. The observations following Theorem 1 are also applicable.

A natural question is to what extent QNFs depend on how the original metric is extended across the event horizon. The following answer was suggested to the author by Peter Hintz; unlike the other results of this paper, it strongly uses axisymmetry of the exact Kerr–AdS metric. Given $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$\mathcal{D}'_m = \{u \in \mathcal{D}' : (D_\phi - m)u = 0\}.$$

The axisymmetry of g implies that $\mathcal{D}'_m(X)$ is invariant under $P(\lambda)$ for each λ. When $0 < \nu < 1$, the trace $T(\lambda)$ is said to be axisymmetric if $T(\lambda)D_\phi u = D_\phi T(\lambda)u$ for each λ, which implies the mapping property $T(\lambda) : \mathcal{X}^k \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X) \to H^{k+1-\mu}(Y) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(Y)$.

Let $P_0(\lambda)$ denote the restriction of $P(\lambda)$ to X_+, where X_+ the intersection of X with the black hole exterior.

Theorem 3. *Let $\nu > 0$ and suppose that $T(\lambda)$ is axisymmetric. If $\nu \geq 1$, then $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ is a QNF if and only if there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a nonzero function*

$$u \in C^\infty(X_+) \cap \mathcal{H}^0(X_+) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X_+)$$

such that $P_0(\lambda_0)u = 0$. The same is true for $0 < \nu < 1$ under the additional condition $T(\lambda_0)u = 0$.

Of course it is possible that a different method of proof could establish Theorem 3 without making use of any additional symmetries.

1.2. **Relation to previous works.** The mathematical study of QNMs for AdS black holes began slightly later than their nonnegative cosmological constant counterparts. QNMs of Schwarzschild black holes were rigorously studied by Bachelot [2] and Bachelot–Motet-Bachelot [3]. Meromorphy of the scattering resolvent for Schwarzschild–de Sitter black holes was established by Sá Barreto–Zworski [41], who also described the lattice structure of QNFs. Expansions of scattered waves in terms of QNMs was established for Schwarzschild–de Sitter space by Bony–Häfner [9]. Later, Dyatlov constructed a meromorphic continuation of the scattering resolvent for Kerr–de Sitter metrics and analysed the distribution of QNFs [18, 19].

All of the aforementioned works used delicate separation of variables techniques to study QNMs, hence are not stable under perturbations. In a landmark paper



FIGURE 1. Two plots showing the range of parameters (a, l, M), or equivalently (a, l, r_+), for which meromorphy holds. On the left is a plot of $|a|/l$ vs. M/l and on the right is a plot of $|a|/l$ vs. r_+/l. The blue shaded region shows the full range of admissible parameters, while the purple region is the regime $r_+^2 > |a|l$ for which meromorphy was established in [46]

[42], Vasy proved meromorphy of a family of operators whose poles define QNFs of Kerr–de Sitter metrics. This method depends only on certain microlocal properties of the geodesic flow, which are stable under perturbations. Additionally, resolvent estimates, expansions in terms of QNMs, and wavefront set properties of the resolvent were also established (not to mention other applications, for instance to asymptotically hyperbolic spaces).

For non-rotating Schwarzschild–AdS black holes, QNMs were treated mathematically by the author in [22] using the Regge-Wheeler formalism [24] (separation of variables). The Regge–Wheeler equations at a fixed angular momentum ℓ in the nonrotating case fit into the framework of classical one-dimensional scattering theory. Using a "black-box" approach, it was shown that the scattering resolvent exists and its restriction to a fixed space of spherical harmonics forms a meromorphic family of operators [22, Section 4]. Therefore discreteness of QNFs for ℓ fixed is solved by identifying them as poles of this resolvent. Furthermore, there exist sequences of QNFs converging exponentially to the real axis, with a precise description of their real parts. In [22], only Dirichlet boundary conditions were considered at the conformal boundary.

For general black hole backgrounds with asymptotically AdS ends, a global definition and discreteness of QNFs was first studied by Warnick [46]. There, QNFs are defined

as eigenvalues of an infinitesimal generator whose associated semigroup solves a mixed initial boundary value problem for the linear wave equation. When applied to the special class of Kerr–AdS metrics, there are two main results:

(1) QNFs at a *fixed* Fourier mode are discrete. This holds for all rotation speeds satisfying the regularity condition $|a| < 1$. More generally, it holds for a more general class of "locally stationary" asymptotically AdS black holes, once the notion of a Fourier mode is appropriately generalized — these spacetimes have some additional symmetries.

(2) The set of all QNFs is discrete provided the rotation speed satisfies the Hawking–Reall bound $|a| < \min\{1, r_+^2\}$. These Kerr–AdS metrics admit a globally causal Killing field; this remarkable property is not shared by either the Kerr or Kerr-de Sitter family of metrics as soon as $a \neq 0$.

Furthermore, self-adjoint boundary conditions of Dirichlet or Robin type may be imposed at the conformal boundary. As mentioned above, this paper generalizes [46] in two ways: the QNF spectrum is shown to be discrete for rotation speeds satisfying $|a| < 1$, and when $0 < \nu < 1$ this discreteness holds for a broader class of boundary conditions than considered in [46].

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Semiclassical preliminaries.** The purpose of this section is to fix notation for the necessary semiclassical microlocal analysis. For a detailed introduction to this subject, the reader is referred to the books [17, 38, 49] and [20, Appendix E].

2.1.1. *Fiber-radial compactification and symbol classes.* Much of the analysis in this paper concerns dynamics in phase space T^*X of a noncompact n-dimensonal manifold X. This is best understood in terms of the fiber-radial compactification $\overline{T}^*X$ of T^*X. Fix a Riemannian metric on X, which induces a norm $|\cdot|$ on T^*X. The fiber $\overline{T}^*_xX$ over $x \in X$ is obtained by gluing an $(n-1)$–sphere $\partial\overline{T}^*_xX$ to T^*_xX at infinity, where the smooth structure is determined by the following condition: the function

$$\xi \mapsto \left(|\xi|^{-1}, |\xi|^{-1}\xi\right)$$

extends to a diffeomorphism between a neighborhood of $\partial\overline{T}^*_xX$ and $[0,1) \times S^*_xX$. Since T^*X is locally trivial, this also determines a smooth structure on $\overline{T}^*X$, which independent of the choice of norm $|\cdot|$. Thus a function $a \in C^\infty(T^*X)$ is smooth up to $\partial\overline{T}^*X$ if and only if it is a smooth function of $(x, |\xi|^{-1}, |\xi|^{-1}\xi)$.

If $\langle\xi\rangle = (1 + |\xi|^2)^{1/2}$, then $\langle\xi\rangle^{-1}$ is a smooth, globally defined boundary defining function on $\overline{T}^*X$. By definition, the set of classical symbols $S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$ of order k consists of all functions $a \in C^\infty(T^*X)$ such that $\langle\xi\rangle^{-k} a$ extends smoothly to $\overline{T}^*X$.

This does not depend on the boundary defining function — near infinity $\langle\xi\rangle^{-1}$ may be replaced by $|\xi|^{-1}$ for instance, but of course the latter is not defined on all of $\overline{T}^*X$.

Taylor expanding $|\xi|^{-k}a$ at $|\xi|^{-1}=0$ shows that $a\in S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$ if and only if there exists a sequence $a_j\in C^\infty(T^*X)$ which are homogeneous of degree $k-j$ in ξ for $|\xi|$ sufficiently large such that

$$a(x,\xi)\sim\sum_{j\geq 0}a_j(x,\xi).$$

This means that

$$\langle\xi\rangle^{-k+J}\left(a-\sum_{j=0}^{J-1}a_j\right)$$

extends smoothly to $\overline{T}^*X$, or equivalently the difference is an element of $S^{k-J}_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$.

In the semiclassical setting, one considers symbols

$$b(x,\xi;h)\in C^\infty([0,h_0);S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X))$$

depending smoothly on a parameter $h\in[0,h_0)$ with respect to the natural Fréchet topology on $S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$. If $b\in S^k_h(T^*X)$, say that

$$b(x,\xi;h)\sim\sum_{j\geq 0}h^j\,b_j(x,\xi)$$

for a sequence $b_j\in S^{k-j}_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$ provided

$$h^{-J}\,\langle\xi\rangle^{-k+J}\left(b-\sum_{j=0}^{J-1}h^j\,b_j\right)$$

extends smoothly to the manifold with corner $[0,h_0)\times\overline{T}^*X$. The space of semiclassical symbols $S^k_h(T^*X)$ consists of symbols admitting such an expansion. The principal part of b is defined to be the leading term b_0.

Finally, let H_a denote the Hamilton vector field of $a\in S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$ on T^*X. Then $\langle\xi\rangle^{1-k}H_a$ extends to a vector field on $\overline{T}^*X$ which is tangent to $\partial\overline{T}^*X$.

Remark. Given $a\in S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$, there exists a unique homogeneous of degree k function $\tilde{a}$ on $T^*X\setminus 0$ such that

$$\langle\xi\rangle^{-k}\,a|_{\partial\overline{T}^*X}=\langle\xi\rangle^{-k}\,\tilde{a}|_{\partial\overline{T}^*X}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let γ_t denote the flow of $\langle\xi\rangle^{1-k}H_a$ on $\overline{T}^*X$, and let $\tilde{\gamma}_t$ denote the flow of $H_{\tilde{a}}$ on $T^*X\setminus 0$. Also write $\kappa:T^*X\setminus 0\to\partial\overline{T}^*X$ for the natural projection. Then for each $(x,\xi)\in T^*X\setminus 0$, the flow line $t\mapsto\gamma_t(\kappa(x,\xi))$ is a reparametrization of $t\mapsto(\kappa\circ\tilde{\gamma}_t)(x,\xi)$.

2.1.2. *Pseudodifferential operators.* The space of semiclassical classical pseudodifferential operators corresponding to $S^k_h(T^*X)$ is denoted by $\Psi^k_h(X)$. There exists a surjective quantization procedure and symbol map

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Op}^h &: S^k_h(T^*X) \to \Psi^k_h(X),\\ \sigma_h &: \Psi^k_h(X) \to S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X).\end{aligned}$$

There is also the non-semiclassical symbol map $\sigma_k : \Psi^k_h(X) \to S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)/S^k_{\mathrm{cl}}(T^*X)$, and $\sigma_k(A)$ may be identified with a unique homogeneous function of degree k on $T^*X \setminus 0$. Thus

$$\langle\xi\rangle^{-k}\,\sigma_h(A)|_{\partial\overline{T}^*X} = \langle\xi\rangle^{-k}\,\sigma_k(A)|_{\partial\overline{T}^*X}.$$

A pseudodifferential operator A is said to be properly supported if for each $g \in C^\infty_c(X)$, the functions $g(x)K_A(x,y)$ and $K_A(x,y)g(y)$ have compact support in $X \times X$. Here $K_A(x,y)$ is the Schwartz kernel of A. In particular, any differential operator is properly supported. The composition of two properly supported pseudodifferential operators $A \in \Psi^k_h(X)$, $B \in \Psi^\ell_h(X)$ is well defined and lies in $\Psi^{k+\ell}_h(X)$. The symbol map is multiplicative: $\sigma_h(A \circ B) = \sigma_h(A)\sigma_h(B)$. Furthermore, a pseudodifferential operator A is said to be compactly supported if $\operatorname{supp} K_A$ is a compact subset of $X \times X$.

2.1.3. *Ellipticity and wavefront sets.* Given $A \in \Psi^k_h(X)$ and $a = \sigma_h(A)$, the characteristic set of A is defined as the closed subset $\{\langle\xi\rangle^{-k} a = 0\} \subseteq \overline{T}^*X$. The elliptic set $\mathrm{ell}(A)$ is the complement of its characteristic set.

If $a \in S^k_h(T^*X)$, say that $(x,\xi) \in \overline{T}^*X$ is not in the essential support of a if there exists an open neighborhood of (x,ξ) in $\overline{T}^*X$ such that

$$\partial^\alpha_x \partial^\beta_\xi a = \mathcal{O}(h^\infty \langle\xi\rangle^{-\infty})$$

uniformly in this neighborhood. The wavefront set $\mathrm{WF}_h(A)$ of $A \in \Psi^k_h(X)$ is defined as the essential support of any $a \in S^k_h(T^*X)$ such that $\mathrm{Op}^h(a) = A$.

2.1.4. *Semiclassical Sobolev spaces.* Semiclassical Sobolev norms $\|\cdot\|_{H^s_h(\mathbb{R}^n)}$ are defined on $H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by

$$\|u\|_{H^s_h(\mathbb{R}^n)} = \|\langle h\xi\rangle^s \hat{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)},$$

where $\hat{u}$ is the usual Fourier transform of u.

This is transferred to the manifold X as usual: fix a cover $X = \bigcup X_i$ by coordinate charts (X_i, φ_i), along with locally finite partition of unity

$$\sum_i \chi_i^2 = 1, \quad \chi_i \in C^\infty_c(X_i).$$

Algebraically, $H^s_{h,\mathrm{loc}}(X) = H^s_{\mathrm{loc}}(X)$, namely the set of all $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ such that $(\chi_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1} \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^n)$. However, the seminorms on this space are h-dependent: they are given

by

$$u \mapsto \|(\chi_i u) \circ \varphi_i^{-1}\|_{H_h^s(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

Given $K \subseteq X$ compact, the Fréchet topology on $H_h^s(X)$ induces a Hilbert space structure on $H_{h,K}^s(X)$, the space of all $u \in H_{h,\mathrm{loc}}^s(X)$ with support in K. This in turn induces the inductive limit topology on $H_{h,\mathrm{comp}}^s(X)$, the space of all $u \in H_{h,\mathrm{loc}}^s(X)$ which have compact support.

With these definitions, any properly supported $P \in \Psi_h^k(X)$ is bounded

$$H_{h,\mathrm{loc}}^s(X) \to H_{h,\mathrm{loc}}^{s-k}(X), \quad H_{h,\mathrm{comp}}^s(X) \to H_{h,\mathrm{comp}}^{s-k}(X)$$

uniformly in h; in the former case, this means that any seminorm of Pu is bounded by finitely many seminorms of u with a constant independent of h.

2.1.5. *Elliptic and principal type estimates.* The simplest microlocal estimate controls u in some region of phase space in terms Pu, provided P is elliptic in a neighborhood of that region. More precisely, one has the followng standard elliptic estimate:

Proposition 2.1 (Elliptic estimate)**.** *Suppose that $P \in \Psi_h^k(X)$ is properly supported, A, $G \in \Psi_h^0(X)$ are compactly supported, and*

$$\mathrm{WF}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{ell}(P) \cup \mathrm{ell}(G).$$

If $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ satisfies $GPu \in H_h^{s-k}(X)$ for some s, then $Au \in H^s(X)$. Moreover, there exists $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that

$$\|Au\|_{H_h^s(X)} \leq C\|GPu\|_{H_h^{s-k}(X)} + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}$$

for each N.

Given $P \in \Psi_h^k(X)$, write the symbol of P in terms of its real and imaginary parts,

$$p - iq = \sigma_h(P).$$

The following propagation of singularities result depends on the sign of q.

Proposition 2.2 (Propagation of singularities)**.** *Suppose that $P \in \Psi_h^k(X)$ is properly supported and A, B, $G \in \Psi_h^0(X)$ are compactly supported. Assume that $\pm q \geq 0$ on $\mathrm{WF}(G)$, and for each $(x,\xi) \in \mathrm{WF}(A)$ there exists $T \geq 0$ such that*

- $\exp(\mp T \langle\xi\rangle^{-1} H_p)(x,\xi) \in \mathrm{ell}(B)$,
- $\exp(\mp t \langle\xi\rangle^{-1} H_p)(x,\xi) \in \mathrm{ell}(G)$ *for each $t \in [0,T]$.*

If $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ satisfies $GPu \in H_h^{s-k+1}(X)$ and $Bu \in H_h^s(X)$, then $Au \in H_h^s(X)$. Moreover, there exists $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that

$$\|Au\|_{H_h^s(X)} \leq C\left(h^{-1}\|GPu\|_{H_h^{s-k+1}(X)} + \|Bu\|_{H_h^s(X)}\right) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}$$

for each N.

2.1.6. *Parameter-dependent differential operators.* Recall the class of parameter-dependent differential operators on X: these are operators $P(\lambda)$ given in local coordinates by

$$P(x, D_x, \lambda) = \sum_{j+|\alpha|\leq k} a_{j,\alpha}(x)\lambda^j D_x^\alpha,$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ is a parameter; the order of $P(\lambda)$ is said to be at most k, and the set of all such operators is denoted $\mathrm{Diff}^k_{(\lambda)}(X)$. The parameter-dependent principal symbol of $P(\lambda)$ is given in coordinates by

$$\sigma_k^{(\lambda)}(P(\lambda)) = \sum_{j+|\alpha|=k} a_{j,\alpha}(x)\lambda^j \xi^\alpha.$$

This is a homogeneous degree k polynomial in (ξ, λ). Moreover, it is a well defined function on $T^*X \times \mathbb{C}_\lambda$.

Note that $P(\lambda)$ is transformed into a semiclassical differential operator $P_h(z) \in \mathrm{Diff}^k_h(X)$ by setting $z = h\lambda$ and defining

$$P_h(z) = h^k P(h^{-k}z).$$

If z depends on h, then with the present definitions there is some subtlety in defining the principal symbol of $P_h(z)$. Formally (and in particular if z is a fixed quantity independent of h) then the semiclassical principal symbol $p = \sigma_h(P_h(z))$ is given by

$$p(x, \xi; z) = \sum_{j+|\alpha|=k} a_{j,\alpha}(x) z^j \xi^\alpha.$$

The semiclassical viewpoint is useful when studying Hamiltonian dynamics, but in other places it will be more convenient to work directly with the parameter-dependent formulation.

2.1.7. *Microlocal partitions of unity on manifolds with boundary.* Let $\overline{X} = X \cup \partial X$ denote a compact manifold with interior X and boundary ∂X. Assume that ∂X is a finite disjoint union,

$$\partial X = \bigcup_{j=1}^{J} Y_j.$$

For each j, let ρ_j denote a boundary defining function for Y_j. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\{x : \rho_j < \varepsilon\}$ is a well defined neighborhood of Y_j in $\overline{X}$. The following is a standard application of the pseudodifferential calculus.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that for each $j = 1, \ldots, J$ there exists*

$$\chi_j \in C_c^\infty(\{x : \rho_j < \varepsilon\}), \quad 0 \leq \chi_j \leq 1$$

satisying $\chi_j = 1$ *near* $\{x : \rho_j < \varepsilon_j\}$ *for some* $0 < \varepsilon_j < \varepsilon$. *Suppose there exist* $W_i \subseteq \overline{T}^* X$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, I$ *such that*

$$\overline{T}^* X \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{J} \pi^{-1}(\{x : 0 < \rho_j < \varepsilon_j\}) \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{I} W_i,$$

where $\pi : \overline{T}^* X \to X$ *is the natural projection. Then there exist compactly supported* $A_i \in \Psi_h^0(X)$, $R \in h^\infty \Psi_h^{-\infty}(X)$ *such that*

$$1 = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \chi_j + \sum_{i=1}^{I} A_i + R$$

and $\mathrm{WF}(A_i) \subseteq W_i$.

2.2. **Lorentzian metrics.** Let g denote a Lorentzian metric of signature $(1, n)$ on an $n+1$ dimensional manifold $\mathbb{R}_t \times X$. Assume that ∂_t is Killing, so that g is "independent of t". Although ∂_t is not required to be timelike, dt is assumed to be timelike. Thus each slice $\{t = \text{constant}\}$ is a spacelike hypersurface.

As a second order differential operator on $\mathbb{R} \times X$, the principal symbol of the wave operator $\Box_g$ is given by

$$\sigma_2(\Box_g)(x, \xi, \tau) = g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx + \tau\, dt, \xi \cdot dx + \tau\, dt),$$

where $\xi \cdot dx$ is the canonical one-form on $T^* X$, and τ is the momentum conjugate to t. Let $\widehat{\Box}_g(\lambda)$ denote the operator obtained from $-\Box_g$ by replacing D_t with $-\lambda$. Thus $\widehat{\Box}_g(\lambda)$ acts on $u \in C^\infty(X)$ by

$$\widehat{\Box}_g(\lambda) u = -e^{i\lambda t} \Box_g e^{-i\lambda t} u$$

This is a parameter-dependent differential operator of order two in the sense of Section 2.1.6. Let

$$\widehat{\Box}_{g,h}(z) = h^2 \widehat{\Box}_g(h^{-1} z), \quad p - iq = \sigma_h(\widehat{\Box}_{g,h}(z))$$

denote the associated semiclassical operator and symbol. Then $(p - iq)(x, \xi; z)$ is just given by $-\sigma_2(\Box_g)(x, \xi, -z)$. In terms of the real and imaginary parts of z,

$$\begin{aligned} p &= -g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx - \operatorname{Re} z\, dt, \xi \cdot dx - \operatorname{Re} \lambda\, dt) + (\operatorname{Im} z)^2 g^{-1}(dt, dt), \\ q &= -2\, (\operatorname{Im} z) g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx - \operatorname{Re} z\, dt, dt). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Let

$$\Sigma = \{\langle \xi \rangle^{-2}\, p = 0\} \subseteq \overline{T}^* X$$

denote the characteristic set of p, and $\widehat{\Sigma} = \Sigma \cap \partial \overline{T}^* X$. For each $z \in \mathbb{C}$, let

$$N = \{\langle \xi \rangle^{-1}\, g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx - \operatorname{Re} z\, dt, dt) = 0\} \subseteq \overline{T}^* X,$$

and let $\widehat{N} = N \cap \partial \overline{T}^* X$.

Lemma 2.4. *The operator $\widehat{\Box}_{g,h}(z)$ has the following properties.*

(1) If $\operatorname{Re} z \neq 0$, then $N \cap \{\langle\xi\rangle^{-2} p = 0\} = \emptyset$.

(2) If $z \in \mathbb{C}$, then $N \cap \{\langle\xi\rangle^{-2} p = 0\} = \emptyset$.

(3) If $\operatorname{Im} z \neq 0$, then $K \subseteq \operatorname{ell}(\widehat{\Box}_{g,h}(z))$ for each compact $K \subseteq \overline{T}^* X$ not intersecting fiber-infinity.

(4) If ∂_t is timelike at $x \in X$, then $\widehat{\Box}_{g,h}(z)$ is elliptic at $\partial\overline{T}^*_x X$ for each $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Recall that by assumption dt is everywhere timelike so $g^{-1}(dt, dt) > 0$.

(1), (2) Since a nonzero causal vector cannot be orthogonal to the timelike vector dt, it follows that p and $g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx - \operatorname{Re} z\, dt, dt)$ cannot vanish simultaneously for finite ξ unless $\xi = \operatorname{Re} z = 0$. This shows (2) for finite ξ. Furthermore, if $z = 0$, then these quantities do not vanish simultaneously for $\xi \neq 0$. But both quantities are homogeneous in ξ when $z = 0$, so $\widehat{N}$ does not intersect the characteristic set when $z = 0$. Since $\widehat{N}$ is independent of z, this is true for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

(3) The same argument as above shows that if ξ is finite and $q = 0$, then $p \neq 0$.

(4) Note that identity

$$z = g^{-1}(\partial_t^\flat, \xi \cdot dx - z\, dt),$$

where $\partial_t^\flat$ is the covector obtained from ∂_t by lowering an index. If ∂_t is timelike and $z = 0$, then

$$(x, \xi) \mapsto g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx, \xi \cdot dx)$$

is homogeneous and positive definite in ξ. This implies that if $z = 0$ and ∂_t is timelike, then $\langle\xi\rangle^{-2} p$ does not vanish on $\partial\overline{T}^*_x X$. But $\langle\xi\rangle^{-2} p$ is independent of z at fiber infinity, so the conclusion holds for each $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

□

Thus Σ is divided into two relatively open components $\Sigma_\pm = C_\pm \cap \Sigma$ for $\operatorname{Re} z \neq 0$, where

$$C_\pm = \{\mp \langle\xi\rangle^{-1} g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx - \operatorname{Re} z\, dt, dt) > 0\} \subseteq \overline{T}^* X.$$

Furthermore, $\widehat{\Sigma}$ is divided into $\widehat{\Sigma}_\pm = C_\pm \cap \widehat{\Sigma}$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ after intersecting with fiber infinity. Each of these sets is invariant under the flow of $\langle\xi\rangle^{-2} H_p$ on $\overline{T}^* X$.

2.3. **Local theory of Bessel operators.** This section reviews some facts about differential operators with inverse square singularities. General elliptic boundary value problems for this class of Bessel operators were recently studied in [23]. Here only the local theory is reviewed, namely on coordinate patches. This is meant to acquaint the reader with the basic objects. In applications, the results of this section must be globalized via partition of unity arguments. This is briefly indicated in Section 5.1; for more details see [23].

2.3.1. *Basic definitions.* Let $\mathbb{R}^n_+ = \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_+$. A typical element $x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+$ is written $x = (x', x_n)$, where $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $x_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$ of square integrable functions is defined with respect to Lebesgue measure.

For each $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$ the differential operators

$$D_\nu = x_n^{\nu-1/2} D_{x_n} x_n^{1/2-\nu}, \quad D_\nu^* = x_n^{1/2-\nu} D_{x_n} x_n^{\nu-1/2}$$

are well defined on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$. Note that D_ν^* is indeed the formal $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n_+)$ adjoint of D_ν. Formally define

$$|D_\nu|^2 = D_{x_n}^2 + (\nu^2 - 1/4) x_n^{-2},$$

which satisfies $|D_\nu|^2 = D_\nu^* D_\nu$.

Now assume that $\nu > 0$, and consider a parameter-dependent operator $P(\lambda)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ of the form

$$P(x, D_\nu, D_{x'}; \lambda) = |D_\nu|^2 + B(x, D_{x'}; \lambda) D_\nu + A(x, D_{x'}; \lambda), \tag{2.3}$$

where $A(\lambda), B(\lambda)$ are parameter-dependent operators on $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}$ of order two, one respectively, and $B(\lambda)$ vanishes at $x_n = 0$. It may also be assumed that the coefficients of $A(\lambda), B(\lambda)$ are constant outside a compact subset of $\overline{\mathbb{R}^n_+}$.

Such an operator will be referred to as a parameter-dependent Bessel operator of order ν. It is easy to check that the formal adjoint $P(\lambda)^*$ satisfies the same conditions as $P(\lambda)$.

2.3.2. *Ellipticity.* Let $A(\lambda)^\circ$ denote the principal part of $A(\lambda)$,

$$A(x, D_{x'}; \lambda)^\circ = \sum_{j+|\alpha|=2} a_{\alpha,j}(x) \lambda^j D_{x'}^\alpha.$$

Thus $A(0, x', \eta; \lambda)^\circ$ is a polynomial of degree two in $(\eta, \lambda) \in T^*_{x'}\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{C}$. Associated with $P(\lambda)$ is the polynomial function

$$\zeta^2 + A(0, x', \eta; \lambda)^\circ, \tag{2.4}$$

indexed by points $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. If $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is an angular sector containing the origin, $P(\lambda)$ is said to be parameter-elliptic at the boudary with respect to Λ at $x' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ if this polynomial does not vanish for $(\zeta, \eta, \lambda) \in (\mathbb{R} \times T^*_{x'}\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Lambda) \setminus 0$. Ellipticity at the boundary (not in the parameter-dependent sense) is defined by the condition that (2.4) evaluated at $\lambda = 0$ does not vanish for $(\zeta, \eta) \in (\mathbb{R} \times T^*_{x'}\mathbb{R}^{n-1}) \setminus 0$.

If $P(\lambda)$ is parameter-elliptic at the boundary, then (2.4) (as a function of ζ) has two non-real roots $\pm\zeta(x', \eta; \lambda)$ for $(\eta, \lambda) \in (T^*_{x'}\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Lambda) \setminus 0$. By convention $\operatorname{Im} \zeta(x', \eta; \lambda) < 0$. Any solution to the ordinary differential equation

$$\left(|D_\nu|^2 + A(0, x', \eta; \lambda)^\circ\right) u = 0 \tag{2.5}$$

is a linear combination of Bessel functions

$$u = c_+ x_n^{1/2} I_\nu(i\,\zeta(x',\eta;\lambda)x_n) + c_- x_n^{1/2} K_\nu(i\,\zeta(x',\eta;\lambda)x_n).$$

Requiring that u is square integrable on $\mathbb{R}_+$ near infinity with respect to ordinary Lebesgue measure implies that $c_+ = 0$; this follows from the asymptotics of Bessel functions [40, Chapter 7.8]. Furthermore, if $\nu \geq 1$, then square integrability near $x_n = 0$ implies also $c_- = 0$. If $0 < \nu < 1$, then the space of solutions to (2.5) is one dimensional, and boundary conditions must be imposed along $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

2.3.3. *Boundary operators.* When $0 < \nu < 1$, one needs to impose boundary conditions to prove coercive estimates. The boundary operator $T(x', D_{x'}; \lambda)$ is written as

$$T(\lambda) = T_1 + \lambda T_0$$

for T_0, T_1 of the following forms:

$$T_1 = T_1^+ \gamma_+ + T_1^- \gamma_-, \quad T_0 = T_0^- \gamma_-,$$

where T_1^+, T_0^- are smooth functions on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and T_1^- is a first order operator on $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Since the boundary is not compact, for the discussion here it should be assumed that all data for $T(\lambda)$ are constant outside a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$.

Depending on the value of ν, different terms should be considered as the "principal part" of $T(\lambda)$. Fix $\mu \in \{1-\nu, 2-\nu, 1+\nu\}$ such that the orders of $T_1^- + \lambda T_0^-$ and T_1^+ do not exceed $\mu - 1 + \nu$ and $\mu - 1 - \nu$ respectively. Here order is taken in the parameter-dependent sense. Given μ as above, define $T(\lambda)^\circ = T(x', D_{x'}; \lambda)^\circ$ to be the boundary operator which for each $(x', \eta) \in T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ satisfies

$$T(x', \eta; \lambda)^\circ = \sigma^{(\lambda)}_{\lceil \mu - 1 + \nu \rceil}(T_1^- + \lambda T_0^-)\gamma_- + \sigma^{(\lambda)}_{\lceil \mu - 1 - \nu \rceil}(T_1^+)\gamma_+.$$

This is the principal part of $T(\lambda)$ — see [23, Section 4] for more details.

2.3.4. *Lopatinskiĭ condition.* Let $0 < \nu < 1$ and suppose that $T(\lambda)$ is a boundary operator with principal part $T(\lambda)^\circ$ as in Section 2.3.3. If $P(\lambda)$ is parameter-elliptic at the boundary with respect to Λ, then $T(\lambda)$ is said to satisfy the Lopatinskiĭ condition with respect to $P(\lambda)$ if for each $(x', \eta, \lambda) \in (T^*\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \Lambda) \setminus 0$ the only solution to the equation

$$\begin{cases} (|D_\nu|^2 + A(0, x', \eta; \lambda)^\circ)\, u = 0, \\ T(x', \eta; \lambda)^\circ u = 0, \\ u(x_n) \text{ is bounded as } x_n \to \infty \end{cases}$$

is the trivial solution $u = 0$. In that case, the operator

$$\mathscr{P}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} P(\lambda) \\ T(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}$$

is said to be parameter-elliptic at the boundary with respect to Λ. The basic consequences of ellipticity (on a compact manifold with boundary) are proved in [23, Section 4], and exploited in Section 5.2 of this paper.

3. Kerr–AdS spacetime

The Kerr–AdS metric is determined by three parameters: (i) $\Lambda < 0$, the negative cosmological constant, (ii) $M > 0$, the black hole mass, (iii) $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the angular momentum per unit mass. Given parameters (Λ, M, a), let $l^2 = |\Lambda|/3$ and introduce the quantities

$$\Delta_r = (r^2 + a^2)\left(1 + \frac{r^2}{l^2}\right) - 2Mr; \quad \Delta_\theta = 1 - \frac{a^2}{l^2}\cos^2\theta;$$
$$\varrho^2 = r^2 + a^2\cos^2\theta; \quad \alpha = \frac{a^2}{l^2}.$$

The following lemma concerns the location of roots of Δ_r.

Lemma 3.1. *Any real root of Δ_r must be nonnegative, and there at most two real roots. If $a = 0$, then Δ_r always has a unique positive root.*

Proof. When $a = 0$ it is clear that Δ_r has a unique positive root, and furthermore $\partial_r\Delta_r(r) > 0$ for $r > 0$.

On the other hand, if $a \neq 0$ then $\Delta_r(0) > 0$ and $\partial_r\Delta_r(0) < 0$. At the same time, $\Delta_r(r) \to \infty$. Since $\partial_r^2\Delta_r > 0$, when $a \neq 0$ any real root of Δ_r must be positive, and there are at most two real roots. □

Let r_+ denote the largest positive root of Δ_r, when it exists.

Assumption. *Throughout, it is assumed that (i) r_+ exists and $\partial_r\Delta_r(r_+) > 0$, (ii) the rotation speed satisfies the regularity condition $|a| < l$.*

The Kerr–AdS metric determined by (Λ, M, a) is initially defined on $\mathcal{M}_+ = \mathbb{R} \times X_+$, where

$$X_+ = (r_+, \infty) \times \mathbb{S}^2.$$

Let $\tilde{t}$ and r denote standard coordinates on $\mathbb{R}$ and (r_+, ∞) respectively. Away from the north and south poles of $\mathbb{S}^2$, let $(\theta, \tilde{\phi})$ denote usual spherical coordinates. Thus $\theta \in (0, \pi)$ and $\tilde{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}/(2\pi\mathbb{Z})$, and these coordinates degenerate as θ tends to either 0 or π. In terms of $(\tilde{t}, r, \theta, \tilde{\phi})$ the metric g is given

$$g = -\varrho^2\left(\frac{dr^2}{\Delta_r}+\frac{d\theta^2}{\Delta_\theta}\right) - \frac{\Delta_\theta \sin^2\theta}{\varrho^2(1-\alpha)^2}\left(a\,d\tilde{t} - (r^2+a^2)\,d\tilde{\phi}\right)^2 + \frac{\Delta_r}{\varrho^2(1-\alpha)^2}\left(d\tilde{t} - a\sin^2\theta\, d\tilde{\phi}\right)^2.$$

Introducing Cartesian coordinates near the north and south poles of $\mathbb{S}^2$ shows that g admits an analytic extension to those coordinate singularities. The dual metric g^{-1} is given by

$$g^{-1} = \frac{\Delta_r}{\varrho^2}D_r^2 + \frac{\Delta_\theta}{\varrho^2}D_\theta^2 + \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\varrho^2\Delta_\theta\sin^2\theta}\left(a\sin^2\theta D_{\tilde{t}} + D_{\tilde{\phi}}\right)^2 - \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\varrho^2\Delta_r}\left((r^2+a^2)D_{\tilde{t}} + aD_{\tilde{\phi}}\right)^2,$$

where $D_\bullet = -i\partial_\bullet$. The volume form induced by g is

$$dg = (1-\alpha)^{-2}\varrho^2\sin\theta\, d\tilde{t}\, dr\, d\theta\, d\tilde{\phi}.$$

Remark. The scaling transformations

$$l \mapsto sl, \quad a \mapsto sa, \quad \mu \mapsto s\mu, \quad r \mapsto sr, \quad t \mapsto st$$

induce a conformal transformation $g \mapsto s^2 g$. By setting $s = l^{-1}$, it is assumed for the remainder of the paper that $l = 1$, or equivalently $|\Lambda| = 3$.

3.1. **Extension across the event horizon.** As usual, g appears singular at the event horizon

$$\mathcal{H}^+ = \{x : r = r_+\} = \{x : \Delta_r = 0\}.$$

The metric may be extended smoothly across this hypersurface by making an appropriate change of variables. Set

$$t = \tilde{t} + F_t(r); \quad \phi = \tilde{\phi} + F_\phi(r), \tag{3.1}$$

where F_t, F_ϕ are smooth functions on (r_+, ∞) such that

$$\partial_r F_t(r) = \frac{1-\alpha}{\Delta_r}(r^2+a^2) + f_+(r), \quad \partial_r F_\phi(r) = a\frac{1-\alpha}{\Delta_r}, \tag{3.2}$$

where f_+ is smooth, and F_t, F_ϕ vanish at infinity. The dual metric in (t, r, θ, ϕ) coordinates reads

$$\varrho^2 g^{-1} = \Delta_r\left(D_r + f_+ D_t\right)^2 + \Delta_\theta D_\theta^2 + 2(1-\alpha)\left(D_r + f_+ D_t\right)\left((r^2+a^2)D_t + aD_\phi\right) + \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\Delta_\theta\sin^2\theta}\left(a\sin^2\theta D_t + D_\phi\right)^2, \tag{3.3}$$

This is clearly smooth up to $\mathcal{H}^+$. In fact, set

$$X = \{r : \Delta_r > -\delta\} \times \mathbb{S}^2,$$

Then g^{-1} extends as a dual Lorentzian metric to $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}_t \times X$ for $\delta > 0$ small. Thus g has the same extension property.

The function f_+ must be chosen so that dt is timelike on $\mathcal{M}$. Since $\sin^2\theta \leq \Delta_\theta$, to show that dt is timelike it suffices to show

$$\Delta_r f_+^2 + 2(1-\alpha)(r^2+a^2)f_+ < -(1-\alpha)^2 a^2.$$

A global choice of f_+ is given by

$$f_+(r) = -\frac{(1-\alpha)}{(1+r^2)}.$$

In summary, there exists a Lorentzian manifold $(\mathcal{M}, g)$ such that the embedding $\mathcal{M}_+ \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ induced by $(\tilde{t}, r, \theta, \tilde{\phi}) \mapsto (t, r, \theta, \phi)$ is isometric. Furthermore, it is possible to choose this extension such that each slice $\{t = \text{constant}\}$ is spacelike.

The condition $\partial_r \Delta(r_+) > 0$ guarantees that $\mathcal{H}^+$ has a positive surface gravity κ: the Killing horizon $\mathcal{H}^+$ is generated by the null vector field

$$K = \partial_t + \Omega \partial_\phi, \quad \Omega = \frac{a}{r_+^2 + a^2}.$$

The surface gravity of $\mathcal{H}^+$ is calculated from the formula

$$\nabla_g g(K, K) = 2\kappa K$$

evaluated on the horizon. Examining the ∂_t component of the above equation on the horizon gives the value

$$\kappa = \frac{\partial_r \Delta_r(r_+)}{2(1-\alpha)(r_+^2 + a^2)}. \tag{3.4}$$

3.2. **Kerr–AdS as an asymptotically anti-de Sitter spacetime.** To analyze the behavior of g for large r, introduce a new radial coordinate $s = r^{-1}$ for large values of r. In fact s is a well defined function on the entirety of $\mathcal{M}_+$ since $r_+ > 0$. Let

$$\mathcal{I} = \{s = 0\}$$

denote the conformal boundary. Noting that

$$\varrho^2 = s^{-2} + \mathcal{O}(1), \quad \Delta_r = s^{-4} + \mathcal{O}(s^{-2}),$$

it follows that $s^2 g$ has a smooth extension to $\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{I}$. Thus $s^2 g$ may be written as

$$s^2 g = -ds^2 + \gamma,$$

where γ is a $(0,2)$-tensor near the conformal boundary $\mathcal{I}$ such that $\gamma|_{\mathcal{I}}$ does not depend on ds. In terms of (t, s, θ, ϕ) and $s \geq 0$ small,

$$\gamma = \frac{d\theta^2}{\Delta_\theta} - \frac{\Delta_\theta \sin^2\theta}{(1-\alpha)^2} d\phi^2 + (1-a^2)^{-2} \left(dt - a\sin^2\theta\, d\phi\right)^2 + \mathcal{O}(s^2),$$

where the $\mathcal{O}$-term denotes a $(0,2)$-tensor on $\mathcal{M}$ with $\mathcal{O}(s^2)$ coefficients. Note that ds is spacelike for $s^2 g|_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $\gamma|_{T\mathcal{I}}$ is a Lorentzian metric on $\mathcal{I}$. The leading term in the expansion of γ is in fact a Lorentzian metric γ_0 on $\mathcal{I}$; both ∂_t and dt are timelike for γ_0.

According to [23, Lemma 2.4] there exists a unique boundary defining function ρ satisfying $\partial_t \rho = 0$ such that

$$\rho^2 g = -d\rho^2 + \gamma(\rho), \tag{3.5}$$

where $\gamma(\rho)$ is a family of Lorentzian metrics on $\mathcal{I}$ satisfying $\gamma(0) = \gamma_0$. Furthermore, $\rho = s + \mathcal{O}(s^3)$. In particular, g is even modulo $\mathcal{O}(\rho^3)$ in the sense of Guillarmou [26] — see [23, Section 2] for more details. Consequences of the evenness property will be exploited throughout this paper.

The function s is also well defined on X, which is identified with a typical time slice of $\mathcal{M}$. Thus a boundary component $Y = \{s = 0\}$ can also be added to X.

3.3. **The manifold with boundary.** As in the previous section, it is useful to glue a boundary component located at $\{s = 0\}$ either to $\mathcal{M}$ or X. At the other end, attach a second boundary component along $\{\Delta_r = -\delta\}$. This can be viewed either as a boundary component of $\mathcal{M}$ or X; in the former case it will be denoted by $\mathcal{H}$ (not to be confused with the horizon $\mathcal{H}^+$), and in the latter case by H. The crucial observation is that dr is timelike in the region bounded by $\mathcal{H}^+$ and the "artificial boundary" $\mathcal{H}$. Now define the compact manifold with boundary

$$\overline{X} = X \cup Y \cup H,$$

which has boundary components $\partial X = Y \cup H$ and interior identified with X.

3.4. **Klein–Gordon equation.** The main object of study is the Klein–Gordon equation

$$\left(\Box_g + \nu^2 - 9/4\right) \phi = 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{M}_+. \tag{3.6}$$

The mass term $\nu^2 - 9/4$ is written to emphasize the importance of the parameter ν, which is required to be strictly positive; thus ν could be referred to as the effective mass. By choosing an extension $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{M}_+$ according to Section 3.1, the Klein–Gordon equations (3.6) continues to make sense on $\mathcal{M}$.

Since this paper is ultimately concerned with quasinormal modes (which solve the homogeneous equation (3.6)), it is more convenient to work with the operator $P(\lambda)$ given by

$$P(\lambda)u = \varrho^2 \left(\widehat{\Box}_g(\lambda) + \nu^2 - 9/4\right) u$$

in the notation of Section 2.2. Up to a multiplicative factor, this is the spectral family of the Klein–Gordon equation (3.6) acting on X. Define the semiclassically rescaled

operator

$$P_h(z) = h^2 P(h^{-1}z),$$

where $z \in [-1,1] + i[-C_0 h, 1]$. This corresponds to

$$\lambda \in [-h^{-1}, h^{-1}] + i[-C_0, h^{-1}],$$

which accounts for the entire half-plane $\{\operatorname{Im}\lambda > -C_0\}$ as $h \to 0$. This point of view is especially useful for the microlocal analysis later in the paper.

As a remark, the correct space on which to study $P_h(z)$ is the weighted space $sL^2(X)$, where $L^2(X)$ is defined by any smooth density on the compactification $\overline{X}$ and $s = r^{-1}$ as before. It is precisely this space for which finite energy solutions to (3.6) are square integrable. It is useful to fix a density μ on $\overline{X}$ given by ϱ^{-2} times the volume form induced on the hypersurface X by the metric g. In that case $P_h(z)^* = P_h(\bar{z})$.

4. Microlocal study of $P_h(z)$

The purpose of this section is to understand the microlocal structure of $P_h(z)$. Let $p - iq = \sigma_h(P_h(z))$ denote the principal symbol of $P_h(z)$. Since

$$p - iq = -\varrho^2 g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx - z\,dt, \xi \cdot dx - z\,dt)$$

and ϱ^2 is strictly positive, various properties of p can be read off directly from Lemma 2.4. In particular, let $\Sigma = \{\langle\xi\rangle^{-1} p = 0\} \subseteq \overline{T}^* X$, which according to Lemma 2.4 is the union of two components $\Sigma_\pm$. The intersection with fiber infinity is again denoted by $\widehat{\Sigma}$.

Remark. Recall that z will range over $[-1,1] + i[-C_0 h, 1]$, and hence there is a slight nuance in viewing $P_h(z)$ as a classical semiclassical pseudodifferential operator when z is not independent of h. If z is fixed, then $p - iq$ is indeed the principal symbol of $P_h(z)$. On the other hand, if $|\operatorname{Im} z| < Ch$ for instance, then q is of lower order in the semiclassical filtration and should not contribute to the principal symbol.

To be entirely pedantic, one should view the principal symbol of $P_h(z)$ as an equivalence class in the space of semiclassical symbols which are only required to satisfy symbolic estimates — see [21] for proofs of the corresponding propagation results in a closely related setting. However, this subtlety will not be emphasized here. Furthermore, it is entirely absent in the original work of Vasy [42], where the Fredholm property and unique solvability are treated separately using non-semiclassical and semiclassical results, respectively.

4.1. Characteristic set.

Since $\partial_t = \partial_{\tilde{t}}$ for $\Delta_r > 0$, the elliptic set of $P_h(z)$ at fiber infinity in the region $\{(x,\xi) : \Delta_r > 0\}$ contains the set

$$\{(x,\xi) : \partial_t \text{ is timelike at } x \text{ in Boyer–Lindquist coordinates}\}.$$

At least away from the poles of $\mathbb{S}^2$, the vector field ∂_t is timelike provided

$$\Delta_r > a^2 \Delta_\theta \sin^2\theta.$$

Changing to Cartesian coordinates, it is also easy to see that ∂_t is always timelike at the poles. In particular,

$$\widehat{\Sigma} \subseteq \{(x,\xi) : \Delta_r \leq a^2\}.$$

The symbol is given explictly by

$$\begin{aligned} p - iq = {} & \Delta_r \left(\xi_r - f_+ z\right)^2 + \Delta_\theta {\xi_\theta}^2 + 2(1-\alpha)\left(\xi_r - f_+ z\right)\left(a\xi_\phi - (r^2+a^2)z\right) \\ & + \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\Delta_\theta \sin^2\theta}\left(\xi_\phi - a\sin^2\theta\, z\right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The non-semiclassical principal symbol of $P_h(z)$ is given by

$$\sigma_2(P_h(z))(x,\xi) = \Delta_r \xi_r^2 + 2a(1-\alpha)\xi_r\xi_\phi + \Delta_\theta {\xi_\theta}^2 + \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\Delta_\theta \sin^2\theta}\xi_\phi^2. \tag{4.1}$$

4.2. **Sources/sinks for the Hamiltonian flow.** Let

$$\Lambda_\pm = \{(x,\xi) : \Delta_r = 0;\ \xi_\theta = \xi_\phi = 0;\ \pm\xi_r > 0\} \subset T^*X \setminus 0,$$

noting that $\Lambda_+ \cup \Lambda_-$ is the conormal bundle to the event horizon $\{\Delta_r = 0\} \subseteq X$. Furthermore, let $L_\pm \subseteq \partial\overline{T}^*X$ denote the image of $\Lambda_\pm$ under the canonical projection $\kappa : T^*X \setminus 0 \to \partial\overline{T}^*X$. From (4.1) it is clear that

$$L_\pm \subseteq \widehat{\Sigma} \subseteq \kappa(\{\xi_r \neq 0\}).$$

In particular, the projective coordinates

$$\rho = |\xi_r|^{-1}, \quad \hat{\xi}_\theta = |\xi_r|^{-1}\xi_\theta, \quad \hat{\xi}_\phi = |\xi_r|^{-1}\xi_\phi,$$

are valid near $\widehat{\Sigma}$, with ρ a (locally defined) boundary defining function for $\partial\overline{T}^*X$. The vector field ρH_p extends smoothly up to $\partial\overline{T}^*X$. To calculate this vector field, note that for $\pm\xi_r > 0$,

$$\partial_{\xi_r} = \mp\rho(\rho\partial_\rho + \hat{\xi}_\theta\partial_{\hat{\xi}_\theta} + \hat{\xi}_\phi\partial_{\hat{\xi}_\phi}), \quad \partial_{\xi_\theta} = \rho\partial_{\hat{\xi}_\theta}, \quad \partial_{\xi_\phi} = \rho\partial_{\hat{\xi}_\phi}.$$

The simultaneous vanishing of $\rho, \hat{\xi}_\theta, \hat{\xi}_\phi, \Delta_r$ defines $L_\pm$ in a neighborhood $L_\pm$. The rescaled Hamilton vector field for $\pm\xi_r > 0$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_r|^{-1} H_p = {} & \pm 2(\Delta_r \pm a(1-\alpha)\hat{\xi}_\phi)\partial_r \pm (\partial_r\Delta_r)(\hat{\xi}_\theta\partial_{\hat{\xi}_\theta} + \hat{\xi}_\phi\partial_{\hat{\xi}_\phi} + \rho\partial_\rho) \\ & + \mathcal{O}(\rho)\partial_r + \mathcal{O}(\hat{\xi}_\theta)\partial_\theta + \mathcal{O}(\hat{\xi}_\phi)\partial_\phi + \mathcal{O}(\hat{\xi}_\theta^2 + \hat{\xi}_\phi^2 + \Delta_r^2 + \rho^2). \end{aligned}$$

Define the functions

$$p_1 = \Delta_\theta {\xi_\theta}^2 + \frac{(1-\alpha)^2}{\Delta_\theta \sin^2\theta}\xi_\phi^2, \quad p_2 = (\Delta_r\xi_r + 2(1-\alpha)a\xi_\phi)^2.$$

Since p_1 is positive definite, the nonnegative quantities $\Delta_r^2 + \hat{\xi}_\theta^2 + \hat{\xi}_\phi^2$ and $\rho^2(p_1+p_2)$ are comparable near $L_\pm$. In particular, the $\mathcal{O}(\hat{\xi}_\theta^2 + \hat{\xi}_\phi^2 + \Delta_r^2 + \rho^2)$ terms above can be replaced by $\mathcal{O}(\rho^2(1+p_1+p_2))$. Furthermore, if $\rho_1 = \rho^2(1+p_2+p_2)$, then

$$\pm\,|\xi_r|^{-1} H_p(\rho_1) \geq 2(\partial_r \Delta_r)\rho_1 + \mathcal{O}(\rho_1^{3/2}) \tag{4.2}$$

near $L_\pm$. The source/sink nature of L_+/L_- follows immediately from (4.2):

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a neighborhood $U_\pm$ of $L_\pm$ in $\overline{T}^*X$ such that for each $(x,\xi) \in U_\pm$,*

$$\exp(\mp t \langle \xi \rangle^{-1} H_p)(x,\xi) \to L_\pm$$

as $t \to \infty$.

Proof. As noted above, the restriction of ρ_1 to a sufficently small neighborhood of $L_\pm$ vanishes precisely on $L_\pm$. It follows from (4.2) that flow lines of $\langle \xi \rangle^{-2} p$ in a small neighborhood of $L_\pm$ converge to $L_\pm$ as $\mp t \to \infty$. □

For Lemma 4.1 to be useful, one needs a (mild) global nontrapping condition implying that all bicharacteristics starting at $\widehat{\Sigma} \cap \kappa(\{\pm\xi_r > 0\})$ either tend $L_\pm$ or otherwise reach $\{(x,\xi) : \Delta_r = -\delta\}$ in appropriate time directions.

Lemma 4.2. *If $\gamma(t)$ is an integral curve of $\langle \xi \rangle^{-1} H_p$, then the following hold.*

(1) If $\gamma(0) \in \widehat{\Sigma} \cap \kappa(\{\pm\xi_r > 0\})$, then $\gamma(\mp t) \to L_\pm$ as $t \to \infty$.

(2) If $\gamma(0) \in \widehat{\Sigma} \cap \kappa(\{\pm\xi_r > 0\}) \setminus L_\pm$, then there exists $T > 0$ such that $\gamma(\pm T) \in \{\Delta_r \leq -\delta\}$.

Proof. (1) This statement is already implied by (4.2). In fact, it suffices to note that

$$\pm|\xi_r|^{-1} H_p(\rho^2 p_1) = 2(\partial_r \Delta_r)(\rho^2 p_1)$$

when restricted to $\kappa(\{\pm\xi_r > 0\})$, and that the vanishing of $\rho^2 p_1$ within $\widehat{\Sigma} \cap \kappa(\{\pm\xi_r > 0\})$ defines $L_\pm$.

(2) This follows from the same argument as in [42, Section 6.3]: recall the characteristic set is contained in $\{r : -\delta < \Delta_r < (1+\varepsilon)a^2\}$, and so

$$((1+\varepsilon)a^2 - \Delta_r) \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}\rho^2 p_1.$$

Combined with the first part, this shows that eventually $\Delta_r \leq -\delta$ along the flow. □

To apply propagation of singularities, the sign of q must be definite in a neighborhood of the integral curves $\gamma(t)$ in Lemma 4.2 (since the imaginary part of z is not necessarily $\mathcal{O}(h)$, this condition must be interpreted modulo $hS_h^2(T^*X)$ — see the remark at the beginning of Section 4). This can be seen as follows: since

$$-|\xi_r|^{-1} g^{-1}(\xi \cdot dx, dt)|_{L_\pm} = \pm(1-\alpha)(r_+^2 + a^2),$$

one has $L_\pm \subseteq \widehat{\Sigma}_\pm$. Since $\widehat{\Sigma}_\pm$ are relatively open in $\widehat{\Sigma}$, this is also true for small relatively open neighborhoods of $L_\pm$ within $\widehat{\Sigma}$. But $\widehat{\Sigma}_\pm$ is invariant under the flow, so Lemma 4.1 implies that $\widehat{\Sigma}_\pm = \widehat{\Sigma} \cap \kappa(\{\pm\xi_r > 0\})$. Referring to (2.2) and using that $\Sigma_\pm$ is also invariant under the flow, each $(x,\xi) \in \widehat{\Sigma}_\pm$ has a neighborhood in $\overline{T}^*X$ such that $\pm(\operatorname{Im} z)\, q \geq 0$ along any flow line through this neighborhood. Since $\operatorname{Im} z \geq -C_0 h$, the result follows.

First is a propagation result away from the radial source/sink $L_\pm$, provided one works with sufficiently regular Sobolev norms. Such results were first proved by Melrose [39] in the asymptotically Euclidean setting. For more information, see [42, Section 2.4, 2.8, 7] and [43, Sections 4.2, 4.4]. This result relies on positivity properties of a subprincipal symbol of $P_h(z)$ (which depends on the choice of density used to define $P_h(z)^*$) given by

$$\sigma_h(\operatorname{Im} P_h(z)) \in S^1_h(T^*X), \quad \operatorname{Im} P_h(z) = (2i)^{-1}(P_h(z) - P_h(z)^*).$$

This is well defined since the non-semiclassical principal symbol of $P_h(z)$ is real so $\operatorname{Im} P_h(z) \in \Psi^1_h(X)$.

For the density μ defined in Section 3.4, one has $P_h(z)^* = P_h(\bar{z})$, and

$$\pm|\xi_r|^{-1} \operatorname{Im} P_h(z)|_{L_\pm} = (1-\alpha)(r_+^2 + a^2) \operatorname{Im} z = \kappa^{-1}(\operatorname{Im} z)(H_p\rho)|_{L_\pm},$$

where κ is the surface gravity (3.4). This factorization of the subprincipal symbol at $L_\pm$ gives a threshold value for $\operatorname{Im} z$ in the following.

Proposition 4.3. *Given a compactly supported $G \in \Psi^0_h(X)$ such that $L_\pm \subseteq \operatorname{ell}(G)$, there exists a compactly supported $A \in \Psi^0_h(X)$ such that $L_\pm \subseteq \operatorname{ell}(A)$ with the following properties.*

Suppose $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ and $GPu \in H^{s-1}_h(X)$ for $s \geq m$, where $m > 1/2 - \kappa^{-1}h^{-1} \operatorname{Im} z$. If there exists $A_1 \in \Psi^0_h(X)$ with $L_\pm \subseteq \operatorname{ell}(A_1)$ such that $A_1 u \in H^m_h(X)$, then $Au \in H^s_h(X)$. Moreover, there exists $\chi \in C^\infty_c(X)$ such that

$$\|Au\|_{H^s_h(X)} \leq Ch^{-1}\|GPu\|_{H^{s-1}_h(X)} + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H^{-N}_h(X)}$$

for each N.

Proof. Since $\operatorname{Im} z$ is not necessarily of size $\mathcal{O}(h)$, one should cite a combination of [42, Proposition 2.10] and [42, Proposition 7.1]. The proofs of these can be somewhat simplified, as in [43, Proposition 4.5]: the weight (namely the function c in [43, Proposition 2.10], used for the positive commutator argument) can be replaced by the function

$$c = \phi(\rho_1)\rho^{-s+1/2},$$

where $\phi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}; [0,1])$ is chosen such that

$$\phi = 1 \text{ near } 0; \quad \phi' \leq 0; \quad \pm|\xi_r|^{-1} H_p\rho_1 > 0 \text{ on the support of } d\phi \circ \rho_1.$$

In view of (4.2), the last condition can be achieved by choosing ϕ supported sufficiently close to 0. □

Similarly, there is a propagation result towards $L_\pm$ provided one works with sufficiently low regularity Sobolev norms.

Proposition 4.4. *Given a compactly supported $G \in \Psi_h^0(X)$ with $L_\pm \subseteq \mathrm{ell}(G)$, there exist compactly supported $A, B \in \Psi_h^0(X)$ such that $L_\pm \subseteq \mathrm{ell}(A)$ and $\mathrm{WF}(B) \subseteq \mathrm{ell}(G) \setminus L_\pm$, with the following properties.*

Suppose $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ and $GPu \in H_h^{s-1}(X)$, $Bu \in H_h^s(X)$ for $s < 1/2 + \kappa^{-1}h^{-1}\operatorname{Im} z$. Then $Au \in H_h^s(X)$, and moreover there exists $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that

$$\|Au\|_{H_h^s(X)} \leq C\left(h^{-1}\|GPu\|_{H_h^{s-1}(X)} + \|Bu\|_{H_h^s(X)}\right) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}$$

for each N.

Proof. The relevant references here are [42, Propositions 2.11, 7.2] □

Remark. In the Kerr–de Sitter case, an additional restriction must be placed on a to ensure that the appropriate Δ_r in that case has derivative which is bounded away from zero in the region $\{\Delta_r \leq a^2\}$, see [42, Eq. 6.13]. This is needed to show the above nontrapping condition, which in turn is crucial to showing discreteness of QNFs. This does not present a problem here since $\partial_r \Delta_r$ is always strictly positive for $r \geq r_+ - \delta$.

4.3. **Hyperbolic estimates.** The final step is to estimate u near the artificial boundary H in terms of $P_h(z)u$. This may be done by observing that $P_h(z)$ is strictly hyperbolic with respect to the hypersurfaces $\{r = \text{constant}\}$ for $\Delta_r < 0$. The only non-standard aspect of this analysis is to work uniformly with respect to the semiclassical parameter.

In general, suppose that g is a Lorentzian metric on a manifold $M = \mathbb{R}_t \times \Sigma$, where Σ is compact without boundary. Furthermore, assume that ∂_t is a Killing field for g. Let $\phi : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$; to avoid notational confusion, let Φ denote the unique stationary lift of ϕ to M such that $\partial_t \Phi = 0$. If $d\phi \neq 0$ on $\phi^{-1}([r_-, r_+])$, then $\phi^{-1}([R_1, R_2])$ is an embedded submanifold of Σ with boundary $\phi^{-1}(R_1) \cup \phi^{-1}(R_2)$ for each $r_- < R_1 < R_2 < r_+$. This all remains valid if ϕ is replaced with Φ, where now $\Phi^{-1}([R_1, R_2])$ is a submanifold of M.

It is also convenient to fix a Riemannian metric h on Σ, and extend it to M via the product metric $h + dt^2$. The norm of a covector α on M with respect to $h + dt^2$ will be denoted by $|\alpha|$. Given $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, and $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$, let

$$\|u\|_{L^2_\gamma(\Sigma)} = \int_\Sigma |u|^2 \, e^{-\gamma\phi} dh$$

denoted the weighted L^2 norm.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that dt, $d\Phi$ are timelike and future pointing on $\Phi^{-1}([r_-, r_+])$, and $P(\lambda)$ is an operator satisfying*

$$P(\lambda) - \widehat{\Box}_g(\lambda) \in \mathrm{Diff}^1_{(\lambda)}(\Sigma).$$

Given $r_- < R_0 < R_1 < R_2 < r_+$ and $C_0 > 0$, there exist positive quantities C, λ_0, γ_0 such that if $\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \lambda_0$ and $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\sqrt{\gamma}\left(\|du\|_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))} + \langle\lambda\rangle\,\|u\|_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))}\right)\\ &\quad\leq C\left(\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}}\|P(\lambda)u\|_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_0,R_2]))} + \|du\|_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_0,R_1]))} + \langle\lambda\rangle\,\|u\|_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_0,R_1]))}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

for all $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$.

Proof. By hypothesis,

$$g^{-1}(dt, dt) > 0, \quad g^{-1}(d\Phi, d\Phi) > 0, \quad g^{-1}(dt, d\Phi) > 0.$$

Given $v \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}\times\Sigma)$, let $T = T[v]$ denote the (covariant) sesquilinear stress-energy tensor associated to v. Written in terms of dv,

$$T(Y, Z) = \operatorname{Re} g^{-1}(Y^\flat, dv)\, g^{-1}(Z^\flat, \overline{dv}) - \frac{1}{2} g(Y, Z)\, g^{-1}(dv, \overline{dv}) \tag{4.4}$$

for real vector fields Y, Z. The energy current associated with Y is the vector field J_Y, defined by $g(J_Y, Z) = T(Y, Z)$. Let $P = P(-D_t)$, so P differs from $\Box_g$ by a first order operator on M. The standard energy identity is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&-\operatorname{Re} e^{-\gamma\phi}\left(\overline{Yv}Pv\right) + e^{-\gamma\phi}R(v, dv)\\ &\qquad = \operatorname{div}_g(e^{-\gamma\phi}(J_Y + |v|^2 Y)) + \gamma e^{-\gamma\phi}(T(Y, d\phi^\sharp) + |v|^2(Y\phi)),\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where $R(v, dv)$ is a quadratic form in (v, dv).

Define the spacelike hypersurfaces

$$\Sigma_\tau = t^{-1}(\tau), \quad \Sigma^r = \Phi^{-1}(r)$$

of constant t and Φ, where Σ_0 is identified with Σ. Furthermore, set

$$\Sigma_t^r = \Sigma_t \cap \Sigma^r,$$

$$\Sigma_t^{[R_1,R_2]} = \Sigma_t \cap \Phi^{-1}([R_1, R_2]), \quad \Sigma^r_{[T_1,T_2]} = \Sigma^r \cap t^{-1}([T_1, T_2]).$$

For any one of the above surfaces, let dS denote the induced measure. Define the quantities

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_t^r(\gamma) &= \int_{\Sigma_t^r} \left(T(Y, N_r) + |v|^2 g(Y, N_r)\right)\, e^{-\gamma\phi} dS,\\ \mathcal{F}_t^{[R_1,R_2]}(\gamma) &= \int_{\Sigma_t^{[R_1,R_2]}} \left(T(Y, N_t) + |v|^2 g(Y, N_t)\right)\, e^{-\gamma\phi} dS,\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where N_r, N_t are future-pointing unit normals to Σ^r, Σ_t.

Applying the divergence theorem to (4.5) and differentiating the resulting identity at $t = 0$ gives

$$\int_{\Sigma_0^{[R_1,R_2]}} \left(-\operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{Yv} P v\right) + R(v, dv)\right) e^{-\gamma\phi} dS \\ = \mathcal{E}_0^{R_2}(\gamma, v) - \mathcal{E}_0^{R_1}(\gamma, v) + \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}_t^{[R_1,R_2]}(\gamma, v)|_{t=0} \\ + \gamma \int_{\Sigma_0^{[R_1,R_2]}} \left(T(Y, d\phi^\sharp) + |v|^2 (Y\phi)\right) e^{-\gamma\phi} dS \quad (4.7)$$

Apply (4.7) with the timelike vector field $Y = dt^\sharp$. It is well known that the integrands in (4.6) and the last integrand on the right hand side of (4.7) are positive definite in (v, dv) [34, Lemma 24.1.2].

Suppose that $v(t, x) = e^{-i\lambda t} u(x)$, where $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$. Introduce the convention

$$d_\lambda u = \lambda u\, dt + \partial_j u\, dx^j, \quad Y_\lambda u = \lambda Y^t u + Y^j \partial_j u,$$

where summation is over the "spatial" indices. Then

$$\mathcal{E}_t^R(\gamma) = e^{2(\operatorname{Im}\lambda)t} E_t^R(\gamma), \quad \mathcal{F}_t^{[R_1,R_2]}(\gamma) = e^{2(\operatorname{Im}\lambda)t} F_t^{[R_1,R_2]}(\gamma),$$

where the integrands in $E_t^R(\gamma), F_t^{[R_1,R_2]}(\gamma)$ are positive definite in $(u, d_\lambda u)$. Similarly the last integrand on the right hand side of (4.7) is $e^{2(\operatorname{Im}\lambda)t}$ times a quantity which is positive definite in $(u, d_\lambda u)$. The integrand in the first term of (4.7) becomes

$$e^{2(\operatorname{Im}\lambda)t} \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{Y_\lambda u} P(\lambda) u\right) + e^{2(\operatorname{Im}\lambda)t} R(u, d_\lambda u). \quad (4.8)$$

The entire identity (4.7) is therefore independent of t after multiplication by $e^{-2(\operatorname{Im}\lambda)t}$. Note that

$$\|Y_\lambda u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))} + \|R(u, d_\lambda u)\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))} \\ \leq C_1 \int_{\Sigma_0^{[R_1,R_2]}} \left(|d_\lambda u|^2 + |u|^2\right) e^{-\gamma\phi} dS.$$

for some $C_1 > 0$ independent of γ. The inequality $2ab \leq \gamma\varepsilon a^2 + \gamma^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1} b^2$ yields

$$\gamma(\|d_\lambda u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))} + \|u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))}) + E_0^{R_2}(\gamma) \\ \leq C\gamma^{-1} \|P(\lambda)\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))} + E_0^{R_1}(\gamma) \quad (4.9)$$

provided $\gamma > 2(C_1 + 2C_0)$. To prove (4.3), first drop the term $E_0^{R_2}(\gamma)$ from (4.9). Possibly increasing γ_0, estimate $E_0^{R_1}(\gamma)$ on the right hand side using (4.9) again, where

now $E_0^R(\gamma)$, $R \in [R_0, R_1]$ appears on the right hand side and $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$. Integrating in R over $[R_0, R_1]$ yields

$$\gamma \left(\|d_\lambda u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))} + \|u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_1,R_2]))} \right) \\ \leq C \left(\tfrac{1}{\gamma} \|P(\lambda)u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_0,R_2]))} + \|d_\lambda u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_0,R_1]))} + \|u\|^2_{L^2_\gamma(\phi^{-1}([R_0,R_1]))} \right)$$

for $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$, which is the required estimate

□

Before proceeding further, some definitions are needed. Suppose that $\overline{\Omega} = \Omega \cup \partial\Omega$ is a manifold with boundary, contained as a closed subset of a compact manifold without boundary $\widetilde{\Omega}$. Given $s \in \mathbb{R}$, the space of restrictions to Ω of $H^s(\widetilde{\Omega})$ functions is denoted $\overline{H}^s(\Omega)$. As a set, $\overline{H}^s_h(\Omega)$ is defined to be $\overline{H}^s(\Omega)$ but with the h-dependent norm

$$\|u\|_{\overline{H}^s_h(\Omega)} = \inf_U \|U\|_{H^s_h(\widetilde{\Omega})},$$

where the infimum is taken over all $U \in H^s_h(\widetilde{\Omega})$ which restrict to u. The space $\dot{H}^s(\overline{\Omega})$ is defined as the subspace of $H^s(\widetilde{\Omega})$ consisting of functions which are supported on $\overline{\Omega}$. The $\dot{H}^s_h(\overline{\Omega})$ norm is just the restriction of the $H^s_h(\widetilde{\Omega})$ norm. Given a smooth density μ on $\overline{X}$, the space $\overline{H}^s(\Omega)$ is identified with the dual of $\dot{H}^{-s}(\overline{\Omega})$ via the $L^2(X;\mu)$ pairing.

With $P(\lambda)$ as in Lemma 4.5, define $P_h(z) = h^2 P(h^{-1}z)$. The inequality (4.3) then implies

$$e^{\gamma(R_0-R_2)} \left(h\|du\|_{L^2(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_2]))} + \|u\|_{L^2(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_2]))} \right) \\ \leq C \left(\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} h^{-1} \|P_h(z)u\|_{L^2(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_2]))} + h\|du\|_{L^2(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_1]))} + \|u\|_{L^2(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_1]))} \right)$$

for $\operatorname{Im} z > -C_0 h$ and γ sufficiently large. Here R_0 is any number smaller than R_1. Setting $\gamma^{-1} = R_2 - R_0$, the previous estimate implies

$$\|u\|_{\overline{H}^1_h(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_2)))} \leq C \left(\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma}} h^{-1} \|P_h(z)u\|_{\overline{H}^0_h(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_2)))} + \|u\|_{\overline{H}^1_h(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_1)))} \right). \tag{4.10}$$

Note that γ can be made arbitrarily large by choosing R_1 (and hence R_0) sufficiently close to R_2.

Lemma 4.6. *With the hypotheses and notation of Lemma 4.5 set $P_h(z) = h^2 P(h^{-1}z)$. Given $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C_0 > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{\overline{H}^s_h(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_2)))} \leq C \left(h^{-1} \|P_h(z)u\|_{\overline{H}^{s-1}_h(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_2)))} + \|u\|_{\overline{H}^s_h(\phi^{-1}((-\infty,R_1)))} \right).$$

for $\operatorname{Im} z > -C_0 h$ and $u \in C^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2]))$.

Proof. The proof is similar to [34, Lemma 24.1.5]. Since ϕ does not have any critical points on $\phi^{-1}([r_-, r_+])$, the latter submanifold of Σ is diffeomorphic to a product

$[r_-, r_+] \times \Sigma'$ for a compact manifold Σ'. Using this product decomposition, one may construct a family of pseudodifferential operators $\Lambda_-^{(m)} \in \Psi_h^m(\Sigma)$ (with $m \in \mathbb{R}$) such that

$$\Lambda_-^{(m)} : \dot{C}^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R))) \to \dot{C}^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R)))$$

for any $R \in (r_-, r_+)$. Moreover, $\Lambda_-^{(m)}$ extends by continuity to an isomorphism

$$\Lambda_-^{(m)} : \dot{H}^s(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R])) \to \dot{H}^{s-m}(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R])).$$

For a detailed construction of $\Lambda_-^{(m)}$ in the non-semiclassical setting, see [25, Sections 4, 5]. The adjoint of $\Lambda_-^{(m)}$ (with respect to some density) is denoted by $\Lambda_+^{(m)}$; if $u \in C^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R]))$ and U is an extension of u to Σ, then the restriction of $\Lambda_+^{(m)} U$ to $\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R])$ depends only on u. In this sense $\Lambda_+^{(m)}$ induces a map

$$\Lambda_+^{(m)} : C^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R])) \to C^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R]))$$

for each $R \in (r_-, r_+)$, and moreover this map extends by continuity to an isomorphism

$$\Lambda_+^{(m)} : \overline{H}^s(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R))) \to \overline{H}^{s-m}(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R))).$$

First assume that $R_2 - R_1$ is sufficiently small so that γ can be chosen arbitrarily large. Apply (4.10) to $\Lambda_+^{(s-1)} u$. Then

$$\|u\|_{\overline{H}_h^s(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_i)))} \text{ is equivalent to } \|\Lambda_+^{(s-1)} u\|_{\overline{H}_h^1(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_i)))} \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

For the term involving $P_h(z)$,

$$P_h(z)\Lambda_+^{(s-1)} = \Lambda_+^{(s-1)} P_h(z) + C,$$

where $C = [P_h(z), \Lambda_+^{(s-1)}]$. Thus $C \in h\Psi_h^s(\Sigma)$. If $u \in C^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2]))$ and U is an extension of u to Σ, then the restriction of CU to $\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2])$ depends only on u since C is a sum of products of differential operators with $\Lambda_+^{(s-1)}$. From the definition of the $\overline{H}^s$ norm, it follows that

$$\|Cu\|_{\overline{H}_h^0(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2)))} \leq Ch\|u\|_{\overline{H}_h^s(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2)))}.$$

Multiplying this by $(\sqrt{\gamma}h)^{-1}$, the commutator term may be absorbed into the left hand side for γ sufficiently large, thereby establishing (1) when $R_2 - R_1$ is sufficiently small. By compactness considerations, this process may be iterated repeated to yield the desired estimate for arbitrary $R_1 < R_2$ in the interval (r_-, r_+) where $d\Phi$ is timelike and future pointing. □

As an application of Lemma 4.6, choose $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\phi^{-1}((R_1, R_2]))$ such that $\varphi = 1$ near $\phi^{-1}(R_2)$. Then for any $\chi \in C_c^\infty(\phi^{-1}((R_1, R_2)))$ such that $\chi = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} d\varphi$, the first part of Lemma 4.6 applied to φu yields

$$\|\varphi u\|_{\overline{H}_h^s(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2)))} \leq C\left(h^{-1}\|\varphi P_h(z)u\|_{\overline{H}_h^{s-1}(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2)))} + \|\chi u\|_{H_h^s(\phi^{-1}((R_1, R_2)))}\right) \tag{4.11}$$

for $\operatorname{Im} z > -C_0 h$ and $u \in C^\infty(\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2]))$.

A similar result is needed for the adjoint $P_h(z)^*$, but now it is less convenient to state the result in terms of cutoffs as in (4.11). Given $R_1 < R_2$, the manifold $\phi^{-1}([R_1, R_2])$ has two boundary components at which either a supported or extendible nature can be considered. Let $H_h^s(\phi^{-1}((R_1, R_2]))^{-,\bullet}$ denote restrictions to $\phi^{-1}((R_1, \infty))$ of $H^s(\Sigma)$ distributions which are supported on $\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2])$. If $\Lambda_-^{(m)}$ are the pseudodifferential operators considered in the proof of Lemma 4.6, then $\Lambda_-^{(m)}$ extends by continuity to an isomorphism

$$\Lambda_-^{(m)} : H_h^s(\phi^{-1}((R_1, R_2]))^{-,\bullet} \to H_h^{s-m}(\phi^{-1}((R_1, R_2]))^{-,\bullet}$$

The analogue of Lemma 4.6 is the following.

Lemma 4.7. *Given $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $C_0 > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$\|u\|_{H_h^s(\phi^{-1}((R_1,R_2]))^{-,\bullet}} \leq C h^{-1} \|P_h(z)^* u\|_{H_h^{s-1}(\phi^{-1}((R_1,R_2]))^{-,\bullet}}$$

for $\operatorname{Im} z > -C_0 h$ and $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ such that $\operatorname{supp} u \subseteq \phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2])$.

Proof. Note that $P_h(z)^* = P_h(\bar{z})$ with respect to the volume density induced by the metric. If ϕ is replaced by $-\phi$, then Lemma 4.5 is valid since $-d\Phi$ and $-dt$ are both past directed; now the condition is $\operatorname{Im} \overline{\lambda} = -\operatorname{Im} \lambda < C_0$. Thus by propagating in the direction of decreasing ϕ, the condition is still that $\operatorname{Im} z$ is bounded below by $-C_0 h$. Suppose that the support of $u \in C^\infty(\Sigma)$ is contained in $\phi^{-1}((-\infty, R_2])$. Fix $R_1 < R < R_2$ and use (4.3),

$$e^{\gamma(R-R_2)} \|u\|_{H_h^1(\phi^{-1}((R,R_2]))^{-,\bullet}} \leq \tfrac{C}{\sqrt{\gamma}} h^{-1} \|P_h(z)^* u\|_{H_h^s(\phi^{-1}((R,R_2]))^{-,\bullet}}$$

Let $\gamma^{-1} = R - R_1$ and commute with $\Lambda_-^{(s-1)}$ as in the proof of Lemma 4.6 provided $R_2 - R$ is sufficiently small. After this initial step, the estimate on $\phi^{-1}((R_1, R))$ can be obtained by propagating as in Lemma 4.6. □

5. The anti-de Sitter end

According to Section 3.2, the Kerr–AdS metric is even modulo $\mathcal{O}(\rho^3)$ [23, Section 2], [26]. With ρ as in Section 3.2, up to a conjugation by $\rho^{(n-1)/2} = \varrho$ the rescaled Klein–Gordon operator

$$P(\lambda) = \varrho^2 \left(\widehat{\Box}_g(\lambda) + \nu^2 - 9/4 \right)$$

is a parameter-dependent Bessel operator in the sense of Section 2.3 with respect to ρ. The class of Bessel operators on a manifold with boundary depends on a choice of boundary defining function, but since ρ and $s = r^{-1}$ are related by $\rho = s + \mathcal{O}(s^3)$, the latter function s defines an equivalent class of operators [23, Section 1].

Lemma 5.1. *$P(\lambda)$ is a parameter-elliptic Bessel operator with respect to any angular sector $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ disjoint from $\mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. This follows from the timelike nature of ∂_t and dt with respect to the metric γ_0 defined in Section 3.2, combined with [23, Lemmas 2.5, 2.6]. The computation is the same as in Lemma 2.4. □

When $0 < \nu < 1$, the operator $P(\lambda)$ must be augmented by elliptic boundary conditions as in Section 2.3.3. Thus assume that $T(\lambda)$ is a parameter-dependent boundary operator of the form

$$T(\lambda) = (T_1^- + \lambda T_0^-)\gamma_- + T_1^+\gamma_+,$$

where the weighted restriction $\gamma_\pm$ are given by

$$\gamma_- u = s^{3/2-\nu} u|_Y, \quad \gamma_+ = s^{1-2\nu}\partial_s(s^{3/2-\nu})u|_Y.$$

Here $\gamma_\pm$ are redefined from Section 2.3.3 to account for the additional conjugation by s. It is assumed that the "principal part" of $T(\lambda)$ (in the sense of Section 2.3.3) is independent of λ. Parameter-ellipticity of the operator

$$\mathscr{P}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} P(\lambda) \\ T(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}$$

with respect to Λ was defined in Section 2.3.4.

5.1. **Function spaces.** Following [23, Section 4], parameter-ellipticity is used to prove coercive estimates for functions supported near Y. These local estimates should be understood as comprising part of a global estimate. For this reason, it is useful to state them on function spaces which are globally defined on X. These spaces are now described.

First, note that by capping off the cylinder $\overline{X}$ at H with a three-disk, it is possible to consider X as the interior of a manifold $\widetilde{X}$ without boundary. Although $\widetilde{X}$ is noncompact due to the end at Y, clearly $\widetilde{X} \setminus X$ is compact.

Fix a smooth density on $\widetilde{X} \cup Y$ defining the space $L^2(\widetilde{X})$. Extend s as a smooth positive function to $\widetilde{X}$ and then let $\mathcal{H}^1(\widetilde{X})$ denote the set of all distributions $u \in sL^2(\widetilde{X})$ such that $s^{3/2-\nu}d(s^{\nu-3/2}u) \in sL^2(\widetilde{X})$. This is a Hilbert space for the norm

$$\|u\|_{\mathcal{H}^1(\widetilde{X})} = \|u\|_{sL^2(\widetilde{X})} + \|s^{3/2-\nu}d(s^{\nu-3/2}u)\|_{sL^2(\widetilde{X})}.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}^0(\widetilde{X}) = sL^2(\widetilde{X})$. To define higher order spaces, let $\mathcal{V}_b(\widetilde{X} \cup Y)$ denote the space of smooth vector fields on $\widetilde{X} \cup Y$ which are tangent to the boundary Y. Given a nonnegative integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s = 0, 1$ let $\mathcal{H}^{s,k}(\widetilde{X})$ denote the set of distributions u such that $V_1 \cdots V_k u \in \mathcal{H}^{s,k}(\widetilde{X})$ for any collection of at most k vector fields $V_j \in \mathcal{V}_b(\widetilde{X} \cup Y)$. These spaces can be normed in the obvious way by fixing a finite generating set of vector fields for $\mathcal{V}_b(\widetilde{X} \cup Y)$. There are also semiclassical norms obtained by

replacing the differential d with hd and any vector field V with hV. Over any compact subset of $\widetilde{X}$ the norms of $\mathcal{H}_h^{s,k}(\widetilde{X})$ and $H_h^{s+k}(\widetilde{X})$ are equivalent.

Define $\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{s,k}(X)$ as the set of restrictions to X of $U \in \mathcal{H}^{s,k}(\widetilde{X})$ equipped with the semiclassical norm

$$\|u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_h^{s,k}(X)} = \inf_U \|u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{s,k}(\widetilde{X})} \text{ where } U \text{ extends } u.$$

Note that $\overline{\mathcal{H}}^1(X)$ is just the set of distribution $u \in sL^2(X)$ such that $s^{3/2-\nu}d(s^{\nu-3/2}u) \in sL^2(X)$ and similarly for the other spaces. Finally, $\dot{\mathcal{H}}^{s,k}(X)$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{H}^{s,k}(\widetilde{X})$ functions which are supported on $X \cup H$.

If $0 < \nu < 1$, then let $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ denote the space of restrictions to X of $C^\infty(\widetilde{X})$ functions which near Y have the form

$$s^{3/2-\nu}u_-(s^2, y) + s^{3/2+\nu}u_+(s^2, y)$$

for $u_\pm \in C^\infty([0, \varepsilon)_s \times Y)$. If $\nu \geq 1$ then $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ is defined to be $C_c^\infty(\overline{X} \setminus Y)$. In either case, let $\dot{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ denote the subspace of functions in $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ which vanish to infinite order at H. Then $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ is dense in $\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{s,k}(X)$ while $\dot{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ is dense in $\dot{\mathcal{H}}^{s,k}(X)$ [23, Section 3].

Remark. Duality for these spaces is not discussed here; a detailed discussion including all the results needed for this paper can be found in [23, Sections 3, 4, 5].

5.2. **Elliptic estimates.** All the results in this section follow from [23, Theorem 2]. First consider the case $\nu \geq 1$. According to Lemma 5.1, $P(\lambda)$ is parameter-elliptic with respect to any angular sector $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ disjoint from $\mathbb{R}$. In the following estimates the supported or extendible nature at H is irrelevant, so the "bar" or "dot" notation will be dropped.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $\nu \geq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\{0 \leq s \leq \delta\})$ satisfy $\varphi_1 = 1$ on $\{0 \leq s \leq \delta'\}$ for $0 < \delta' < \delta$ and $\varphi_2 = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_1$, then the following hold.*

(1) If $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $h > 0$, then

$$\|\varphi_1 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{1,k}(X)} \leq C\left(\|\varphi_2 P_h(z)u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)} + \|\varphi_2 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)}\right)$$

for each $u \in \mathcal{F}_\nu(X)$, where $C > 0$ is independent of z.

(2) If z ranges over a compact subset of $\Lambda \setminus 0$ and $h > 0$, then

$$\|\varphi_1 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{1,k}(X)} \leq C\left(\|\varphi_2 P_h(z)u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)} + h^2\|\varphi_2 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)}\right)$$

for each $u \in \mathcal{F}_\nu(X)$, where $C > 0$ is independent of z.

The analogous result for $0 < \nu < 1$ involves a somewhat awkward dependence on h after rescaling $T(\lambda)$ to $T(h^{-1}z)$, but note that the precise powers of h which occur are unimportant. In the following proposition, let μ be the order of $T(\lambda)$ as explained in Section 2.3.3.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $0 < \nu < 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\{0 \leq s \leq \delta\})$ satisfy $\varphi_1 = 1$ on $\{0 \leq s \leq \delta'\}$ for $0 < \delta' < \delta$ and $\varphi_2 = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} \varphi_1$, then the following hold.*

(1) If $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $h > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\varphi_1 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{1,k}(X)} \leq C \left(h^{-1} \|\varphi_2 P_h(z) u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)} + C h^\mu \|T(h^{-1}z)u\|_{H_h^{k+1-\mu}(Y)} \right) \\ + C \|\varphi_2 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)}\end{aligned}$$

for each $u \in \mathcal{F}_\nu(X)$, where $C > 0$ is independent of z.

(2) If z ranges over a compact subset of $\Lambda \setminus 0$ and $h > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\varphi_1 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{1,k}(X)} \leq C \left(h^{-1} \|\varphi_2 P_h(z) u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)} + C h^\mu \|T(h^{-1}z)u\|_{H_h^{k+1-\mu}(Y)} \right) \\ + C h^2 \|\varphi_2 u\|_{\mathcal{H}_h^{0,k}(X)}\end{aligned}$$

for each $u \in \mathcal{F}_\nu(X)$, where $C > 0$ is independent of z.

There are also estimates for the formal adjoint $P_h(z)^*$ if $\nu \geq 1$, or $\mathscr{P}_h(z)^*$ if $0 < \nu < 1$. However, the formal adjoint $\mathscr{P}_h(z)^*$ is no longer a scalar operator — see [23, Section 4] where the formal adjoint is defined (which is the same as in the Boutet de Monvel calculus for smooth boundary value problems). Furthermore, [23, Theorem 2] only treats estimates for the formal adjoint when $k = 0$, although this does not present a problem here.

6. Fredholm property and meromorphy

In this section, the Fredholm property for $P(\lambda)$ and meromorphy of $P(\lambda)^{-1}$ is derived from estimates on $P(\lambda)$, combined with some standard arguments from functional analysis. Of course $P(\lambda)$ should be replaced by $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$ when $0 < \nu < 1$.

6.1. The case $\nu \geq 1$.

The simpler case $\nu \geq 1$ is considered first. Assume that $z \in [-1, 1] + i[-C_0 h, 1]$ for some $C_0 > 0$. Furthermore, fix an angular sector $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ in the upper half-plane, disjoint from $\mathbb{R} \setminus 0$.

Proposition 6.1. *If $C_0 < \kappa(k + 1/2)$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$, a compactly supported function $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$, and $\varphi \in C^\infty(\overline{X})$ supported arbitrarily close Y such that the following hold for $u \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$.*

(1) If $z \in [-1,1] + i[-C_0 h, 1]$, then

$$\|u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_h^{1,k}(X)} \leq C\left(h^{-1}\|P_h(z)u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_h^{0,k}(X)} + \|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)} + \|\varphi u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{0,k}(X)}\right) \tag{6.1}$$

for any N, and $h > 0$ sufficiently small.

(2) If $z \in ([-1,1] + i[\varepsilon, 1]) \cap \Lambda$ for $\varepsilon > 0$, then

$$\|u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_h^{1,k}(X)} \leq Ch^{-1}\|P_h(z)u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}_h^{0,k}(X)} \tag{6.2}$$

for $h > 0$ sufficiently small.

Proof. Let $u \in \overline{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ and $f := P_h(z)$. Begin by choosing two functions $\zeta, \psi \in C^\infty(\overline{X}; [0,1])$ subject to the following conditions:

(1) $\operatorname{supp}\psi \subseteq \{x : 0 \leq s < \delta'\}$ and $\psi = 1$ near $\{x : 0 \leq s < \delta\}$, where $0 < \delta' < \delta$ and δ is provided by Proposition 5.2.

(2) $\operatorname{supp}\zeta \subseteq \{x : -\delta \leq \Delta_r < -\delta/2\}$ and $\zeta = 1$ near $\{x : -\delta \leq \Delta_r < -2\delta/3\}$.

According to Lemma 2.3 it is possible to find a microlocal partition of unity

$$1 = \zeta + \psi + \sum_{j=1}^{J} A_j + R,$$

where the operators $A_j \in \Psi_h^0(X)$, $R \in h^\infty \Psi_h^\infty(X)$ are compactly supported, and each $A \in \{A_1, \ldots, A_J\}$ has one of the following properties:

(1) $\operatorname{WF}(A) \subseteq \operatorname{ell}(P_h(z))$. Using Proposition 2.1,

$$\|Au\|_{H_h^{s+1}(X)} \leq C\|Gf\|_{H_h^{s-1}(X)} + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}$$

for G microlocalized near $\operatorname{WF}(A)$ and some $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$. The constant C is uniform for $z \in [-1,1] + i[-C_0 h, 1]$.

(2) $\operatorname{WF}(A)$ is contained in a small neighborhood of $L_\pm$. In order to apply Proposition 4.3, the imaginary part of z must satisfy $\operatorname{Im} z > \kappa(\frac{1}{2} - s)$. In that case,

$$\|Au\|_{H_{\hbar}^s(X)} \leq Ch^{-1}\|GPu\|_{H_h^{s-1}(X)} + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}$$

for some G microlocalized near $\operatorname{WF}(A)$ and some $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X_\delta)$. The constant C is uniform for $z \in [-1,1] + i[-C_0 h, 1]$, provided that $C_0 > \kappa(\frac{1}{2} - s)$.

(3) $\operatorname{WF}(A)$ is contained a neighborhood of a point $(x_0, \xi_0) \in \widehat{\Sigma}_+ \setminus L_+$. By shrinking $\operatorname{WF}(A)$ if necessary, for any neighborhood $U_+ \supseteq L_+$ there exists $T > 0$ such that

$$\exp(-T\langle\xi\rangle^{-1} H_p)(\operatorname{WF}(A)) \subseteq \operatorname{ell}(B),$$

for any $B \in \Psi_0^h(X)$ such that $\mathrm{WF}(B) \subseteq U_+$ — this is Lemma 4.2. Furthermore, any such flow line is entirely contained in Σ_+. Since $\operatorname{Im} z \geq -C_0 h$, the imaginary part q is nonnegative (modulo $hS_h^2(T^*X)$) in a neighborhood of

$$\bigcup_{t\in[-T,0]} \exp(t\,\langle\xi\rangle^{-1} H_p)(\mathrm{WF}(A)). \tag{6.3}$$

It is now possible to combine propagation of singularities (Proposition 2.2) with the previous part (2). For some G_1 microlocalized near the set (6.3) and G as in (2),

$$\|Au\|_{H_h^s(X)} \leq Ch^{-1}\left(\|Gf\|_{H_h^{s-1}(X)} + \|G_1 f\|_{H_h^{s-1}(X)}\right) + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}$$

for some $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$.

The same argument applies if $(x_0,\xi_0) \in \widehat{\Sigma}_- \setminus L_-$, making sure to reverse the direction of the flow and noting that the sign of q is also reversed.

(4) $\mathrm{WF}(A) \cap \partial\overline{T}^*X = \emptyset$. Then

$$\|Au\|_{H_h^s(X)} \leq C\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}$$

for some $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$.

The estimates on Au are applied with Sobolev index $s = 1 + k$ where $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $C_0 > 0$ is subject to the condition $C_0 < \kappa(k + 1/2)$. The term ψu is then estimated in $\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{1,k}(X)$ using the first part of Proposition 5.2.

In the region where $\Delta_r < 0$, Lemma 4.6 is applicable with the function $\phi = -r$, since there $-dr$ is timelike and forward-pointing. Apply (4.11) to estimate

$$\|\zeta u\|_{\overline{H}_h^s(X)} \leq C\left(h^{-1}\|\zeta P_h(z)u\|_{\overline{H}_h^{s-1}(X)} + \|\chi u\|_{H_h^s(X)}\right),$$

where χ has compact support in $\{-\delta < \Delta_r < 0\}$. Here the $\overline{H}_h^s(X)$ notation refers extendibility at H and s is chosen to be $s = k + 1$. Finally, to estimate χu choose ζ_1 such that $\zeta = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp}\zeta_1$. According to the derivation of (4.11), the term χ is supported near $\operatorname{supp} d\zeta$, hence it may be assumed that $\chi\zeta_1 = 0$. So now find a new microlocal partition of unity

$$1 = \zeta_1 + \psi + \sum_{j=1}^{J'} A_j' + R',$$

where each A_j' again falls into one of the classes above. Apply this to χu and use $\chi\zeta_1 = 0$ along with the previous bounds on $A_j' u$ and ψu. Altogether, this implies (6.1) for $z \in [-1,1] + i[-C_0 h, 1]$ provided $C_0 < \kappa(1/2 + k)$.

Now suppose that $z \in ([-1,1] + i[\varepsilon, 1]) \cap \Lambda$. According to Lemma 2.4, if $\mathrm{WF}(A) \cap \partial\overline{T}^*X = \emptyset$, then $P_h(z)$ is elliptic on $\mathrm{WF}(A)$. Thus there is a stronger estimate in that

case,

$$\|Au\|_{H_h^s(X)} \leq C\|Gf\|_{H_h^{s-1}(X)} + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}.$$

Similarly, the first estimate of Proposition 5.2 can be replaced by the (stronger) second estimate. For h sufficiently small, these errors can be absorbed in the left hand side, proving (6.2). □

Next, similar estimates must be established for the formal adjoint of $P_h(z)$. This formal adjoint is taken with respect to the $L^2(X)$ inner product, where the density on $\overline{X}$ is defined in Section 3.4; thus $P_h(z)^* = P_h(\bar{z})$. Reversing the directions of propagation and arguing as in Proposition 6.1, one has similar estimates for $P_h(z)^*$ with $z \in [-1,1] + i[-C_0h, 1]$. Fix $\psi \in C^\infty(\overline{X})$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\psi \subseteq \{x : 0 \leq s < \delta\}$ and $\psi = 1$ near $\{x : 0 \leq s < \delta'\}$, where $0 < \delta' < \delta$ are sufficiently small. The next proposition provides estimates for $(1-\psi)u$ in terms of $P_h(z)^*u$. These estimates must be combined with adjoint estimates near the boundary (which were not reviewed in this paper) using the results of [23, Sections 4, 5].

Proposition 6.2. *Let $\psi \in C^\infty(\overline{X})$ be as in the previous paragraph. If $C_0 < \kappa(s-1/2)$, then there exists a constant $C > 0$, a function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\overline{X} \setminus Y)$, and a compactly supported function $\chi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that the following hold for $u \in \dot{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$.*

(1) If $z \in [-1,1] + i[-C_0h, 1]$, then

$$\|(1-\psi)u\|_{\dot{H}_h^{1-s}(X)} \leq C\left(h^{-1}\|\varphi P_h(z)^*u\|_{\dot{H}_h^{-s}(X)} + \|\chi u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)}\right) \tag{6.4}$$

for any N, and $h > 0$ sufficiently small.

(2) If $z \in ([-1,1] + i[\varepsilon, 1]) \cap \Lambda$ for $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists $\chi_1 \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that

$$\|u\|_{\dot{H}_h^{1-s}(X)} \leq Ch^{-1}\|\varphi P_h(z)^*u\|_{\dot{H}_h^{-1}(X)} + \mathcal{O}(h^\infty)\|\chi_1 u\|_{H_h^{-N}(X)} \tag{6.5}$$

for h sufficiently small.

Proof. The proof follows by constructing a pseudodifferential partition of unity as in the proof of Proposition 5.2. The reference to Proposition 4.3 must be replaced by Proposition 4.4. Thus the a priori control for u comes the supported nature of u at H rather than $L_\pm$: thus the application of (4.11) is replaced by Lemma 4.7. □

For duality purposes, Proposition 6.2 should applied with $s = k+1$ so that the Sobolev indices appearing there are dual to those in Proposition 6.1. Note that the threshhold condition on C_0 is therefore the same in both Proposition 6.1, 6.2. There is a slightly subtlety with this: in [23], adjoint estimates are only established for $k = 0$, which corresponds to $s = 1$. This problem will be overcome below.

To set up a Fredholm problem, introduce the space

$$\mathcal{X}^k = \{u \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}^{1,k}(X) : P(0)u \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}^{0,k}(X)\},$$

equipped with the norm $\|u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{1,k}(X)} + \|P(0)u\|_{\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{0,k}(X)}$. This space is complete, and in fact $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\nu(X)$ is dense in $\mathcal{X}$ [23, Lemma 5.1]. It is now possible to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. For $k = 0$ the Fredholm property follows from [23, Theorem 4] using the estimates in Propositions 6.1, 6.2 (and additional estimates for the formal adjoint near Y, established by [23, Theorem 1]). Similarly [23, Theorem 5] shows the invertibility statement for $k = 0$ provided $\operatorname{Im}\lambda$ sufficiently large and positive.

It remains to handle larger values of k. Write $P^{(k)}(\lambda)$ for the operator

$$P(\lambda) : \mathcal{X}^k \to \overline{\mathcal{H}}^{0,k}(X).$$

Proposition 6.1 shows that $P^{(k)}(\lambda)$ has closed range and finite dimensional kernel in the half-plane $\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \kappa(k+1/2)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, but the adjoint estimates with $k = 0$ do not directly show $P^{(k)}(\lambda)$ has finite dimensional cokernel for larger k. On the other hand, choose $\operatorname{Im}\lambda_0 > 0$ sufficiently large so that $P^{(0)}(\lambda)$ is invertible. Clearly injectivity of $P^{(0)}(\lambda_0)$ implies injectivity of $P^{(k)}(\lambda_0)$. Furthermore, suppose that $f \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}^{0,k}(X) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{H}}^{0}(X)$. Let $u \in \mathcal{X}^0$ denote the unique solution to

$$P(\lambda_0)u = f.$$

The claim is that actually $u \in \mathcal{X}^k$. This is proved in a local fashion similar to Proposition 5.2. Near Y, the elliptic regularity in [23, Theorem 3] implies u is locally in $\mathcal{H}^{1,k}(X)$. At elliptic points in the interior X, it suffices to apply standard elliptic regularity. Next, since $u \in H^1$ microlocally near $L_\pm$ and $\operatorname{Im}\lambda_0 > 0$, the threshhold condition in Proposition 4.3 is satisfied; thus u is in H^{1+k} microlocally near $L_\pm$. This regularity is then propagated along null bicharacteristics using Proposition 2.2 and the nontrapping condition 4.2.

This shows that $P^{(k)}(\lambda)$ is invertible at $\lambda = \lambda_0$, hence of index 0. On the other hand the index of left semi-Fredholm operators (namely those with closed range and finite dimensional kernel) is constant on connected components, noting that the index may take the value $-\infty$. This implies that $P^{(k)}(\lambda)$ is Fredholm of index zero provided $\operatorname{Im}\lambda > \kappa(k + 1/2)$, and is invertible sufficiently far up in the upper half-plane.

□

6.2. **The case $0 < \nu < 1$.** Again assume that $z \in [-1, 1]+i[-C_0h, 1]$ for some $C_0 > 0$. Fix a boundary operator $T(\lambda)$ as in Section 5 such that

$$\mathscr{P}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} P(\lambda) \\ B(\lambda) \end{pmatrix}$$

is elliptic with respect to an angular sector $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ disjoint from $\mathbb{R} \setminus 0$. Assume that the principal part of $T(\lambda)$ (in the sense of Section 2.3.3) is independent of λ.

Proof of Theorem 2. Propositions 6.1, 6.2 have analogues in this setting, replacing reference to Proposition 5.2 with Proposition 5.3. The microlocal estimates on X and hyperbolic estimate near H are unchanged. The only non-obvious modification occurs in the adjoint estimates near Y, which is explained in detail in [23, Sections 4, 5]. The Fredholm property for $k = 0$ again follows from [23, Theorem 3]. This relies on adjoint estimates near Y which are only established for $k = 0$. Thus the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1 above is needed to handle larger values of k. □

7. Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem 3 is a corollary of the following proposition.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Given $f \in C^\infty(X) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X)$ such that $\operatorname{supp} f \subseteq X \setminus X_+$, there exists a unique solution to the problem*

$$P(\lambda)u = f, \quad \operatorname{supp} u \subseteq X \setminus X_+,$$

such that $u \in C^\infty(X) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X)$.

Delaying the proof of Proposition 7.1 for a moment, Theorem 3 is now established by precisely the same argument as [28, Lemma 2.1]:

Proof of Theorem 3. See also [28, Lemma 2.1]. First suppose that $\nu \geq 1$. If λ_0 is a pole of $P(\lambda)^{-1}$, then there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a nonzero $v \in C^\infty(X) \cap \mathcal{H}^0(X) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X)$ such that $P(\lambda_0)u = 0$. The restriction of v to X_+ is nonzero, since otherwise v would be supported in $X \setminus X_+$ which implies $v = 0$ according to Proposition 7.1. Thus $u := v|_{X_+}$ is nonzero and $P_0(\lambda_0)u = 0$.

Conversely, assume that λ_0 is not a pole of $P(\lambda)$. Suppose that there exists nonzero $u \in C^\infty(X_+) \cap \mathcal{H}^0(X_+) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X_+)$ such that $P_0(\lambda_0)u = 0$. Extend u arbitrarily to X as an element $\widetilde{u} \in C^\infty(X_+) \cap \mathcal{H}^0(X_+) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X_+)$; according to Proposition 7.1, the equation $P(\lambda_0)v = P(\lambda_0)\widetilde{u}$ has a solution $v \in C^\infty(X) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X)$ such that $\operatorname{supp} v \subseteq X \setminus X_+$. Then $\widetilde{u} - v$ is nonzero and $P(\lambda)(\widetilde{u} - v) = 0$, which is contradiction.

The same argument applies when $0 < \nu < 1$ since $T(\lambda)$ is axisymmetric, replacing $P(\lambda)$ with $\mathscr{P}(\lambda)$. □

Although Proposition 7.1 is closely related to the results of [44] on asymptotically de-Sitter spacetimes, a direct proof is outlined here — see also [50, Lemma 1] for the same type of result (at least for the uniqueness part).

Define the Riemannian metric

$$h = \frac{1}{\Delta_\theta} d\theta^2 + \frac{\Delta_\theta \sin^2\theta}{(1-\alpha)^2} d\phi^2,$$

which extends smoothly across the poles to $\mathbb{S}^2$. Let d_y denote the differential on $\mathbb{S}^2$ and $|d_y u|_h$ the magnitude of d_y with respect to h. The idea is to apply an energy identity in the region where $\Delta_r < 0$. First define $\rho = r_+ - r$, which is positive in that region. Then for any $N \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in C^\infty(X)$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_\rho \left(\rho^N \left(-\Delta_r |\partial_\rho u|^2 + |d_y u|_h^2\right)\right) &= 2\rho^N \operatorname{Re}\left(\partial_\rho \bar{u} \left(-\Delta_r \partial_\rho^2 u\right) + h^{-1}(d_y \partial_\rho u, d_y \bar{u})\right) \\ &\quad + N\rho^{N-1}\left(-\Delta_r |\partial_\rho u|^2 + |d_y u|_h^2\right) \\ &\quad + \rho^N R(u, du),\end{aligned}$$

where $R(u, du)$ is a quadratic form in (u, du) which is independent of N (at this stage $R(u, du)$ is just $-(\partial_r \Delta_r)|\partial_\rho u|^2$). Given $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$, integrate over the region $[\varepsilon, \delta]_\rho \times \mathbb{S}^2$ and apply Green's theorem to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^N E(\delta) - \rho^N E(\varepsilon) &= 2\int_{[\varepsilon,\delta]_\rho \times \mathbb{S}^2} \rho^N \operatorname{Re}\left(\partial_\rho \bar{u}\left(-\Delta_r \partial_\rho^2 u + \Delta_h u\right)\right) d\rho\, dh \\ &\quad + N\int_\varepsilon^\delta \rho^{N-1} E(\rho)\, d\rho + \int_{[\varepsilon,\delta]_\rho \times \mathbb{S}^2} \rho^N R(u, du)\, d\rho\, dh,\end{aligned}$$

where $E(\rho) = \int_{\mathbb{S}^2} -\Delta_r |\partial_\rho u|^2 + |d_y u|_h^2\, dh$. In general, $-\Delta_r \partial_\rho^2 + \Delta_h$ differs from $-P(\lambda)$ by a second order operator. On the other hand, after restricting to $\mathcal{D}'_m(X)$ this difference is of first order and can be absorbed in $R(u, du)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^N E(\delta) - \rho^N E(\varepsilon) &= -2\int_{[\varepsilon,\delta]_\rho \times \mathbb{S}^2} \rho^N \operatorname{Re}\left(\partial_\rho \bar{u}\, P(\lambda) u\right) d\rho\, dh \\ &\quad + N\int_\varepsilon^\delta \rho^{N-1} E(\rho)\, d\rho + \int_{[\varepsilon,\delta]_\rho \times \mathbb{S}^2} \rho^N R(u, du)\, d\rho\, dh \quad (7.1)\end{aligned}$$

for each $u \in C^\infty(X) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X)$, where now $R(u, du)$ is a real quadratic form in (u, du) which depends on λ and m.

Proof of Proposition 7.1. To prove the uniqueness statement, suppose $u \in C^\infty(X) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X)$ satisfies $P(\lambda)u = 0$ and $\operatorname{supp} u \subseteq X \setminus X_+$. Apply (7.1) with N large and negative. Since Δ_r vanishes to first order at $\mathcal{H}^+$, the last integral of $\rho^N R(u, du)$ is dominated by the integral of $N\rho^{N-1}E(\rho)$ for N sufficiently negative. Furthermore, $\rho^N E(\varepsilon)$ tends to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$ for any N since u vanishes to infinite order at $\mathcal{H}^+$. Again by the nonnegativity of $E(\delta)$ this gives $E(\delta) = 0$ for each $\delta > 0$. Since $E(\rho)$ controls $\|u(\rho, \cdot)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{S}^2)}$, this implies $u = 0$ by Poincaré inequality.

For the existence part of the proof, note that the adjoint of $P(\lambda)$ with respect to $d\rho\, dh$ is $P(\bar{\lambda})$, so (7.1) also applies to $P(\lambda)^*$. The quadratic form can still be dominated by the $N\rho^{N-1}E(\rho)$ term, but now the sign of the last term in (7.1) is nonnegative. In particular, assume that $v \in C^\infty(X) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X)$ satisfies $\operatorname{supp} v \subseteq \{\rho < \delta/2\}$ for some

$\delta > 0$ fixed. Then $E(\delta) = 0$ in (7.1) while $\rho^N E(\varepsilon) \to 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in light of the ρ^N factor. Combined with Poincaré inequality, this implies

$$N \int_0^\delta \rho^{N-1} \|v(\rho,\cdot)\|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{S}^2)}\, d\rho \leq C \int_0^\delta \rho^N \|P(\lambda)^* v(\rho,\cdot)\|^2_{H^0(\mathbb{S}^2)}\, d\rho$$

for $N > 0$ sufficiently large. Furthermore, by commuting with an elliptic pseudodifferential operator on $\mathbb{S}^2$ of order $-s$ and absorbing the commutator into the left hand side by possibly increasing N,

$$N \int_0^\delta \rho^{N-1} \|v(\rho,\cdot)\|^2_{H^{-s+1}(\mathbb{S}^2)}\, d\rho \leq C \int_0^\delta \rho^N \|P(\lambda)^* v(\rho,\cdot)\|^2_{H^{-s}(\mathbb{S}^2)}\, d\rho. \tag{7.2}$$

Thus N depends on λ, m, and s.

Now suppose that $f \in C^\infty(X \setminus X_+) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$ vanishes to infinite order at $\mathcal{H}^+$, so in particular $f \in \rho^{(K-1)/2} L^2((0,\delta); H^s(\mathbb{S}^2)) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$ for each $K > 0$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Define the form ℓ mapping $P(\lambda)^* v \mapsto \langle f, v\rangle_{L^2((0,\delta)\times\mathbb{S}^2)}$, where $v \in C^\infty(X \setminus X_+) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$ and $\rho < \delta/2$ on the support of v. The estimate (7.2) shows that ℓ is bounded on the set of all such $P(\lambda)^* v$. Then Hahn-Banach and the Riesz representation imply the existence $u \in \rho^{K/2} L^2((0,\delta); H^s(\mathbb{S}^2)) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$ such that

$$\langle f, v\rangle_{L^2(0,\delta)\times\mathbb{S}^2} = \langle u, P(\lambda)^* v\rangle$$

where the pairing on the right is duality between $\rho^{K/2} L^2((0,\delta); H^s(\mathbb{S}^2)) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$ and $\rho^{-K/2} L^2((0,\delta); H^{-s}(\mathbb{S}^2)) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$ and v is as above. In particular $P(\lambda) u = f$ in $\mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$.

A mollification procedure and the first part of the proof show that once a solution $u \in \rho^N L^2((0,\delta) \times \mathbb{S}^2) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$ to $Pu = f$ exists (with f smooth and vanishing to infinite order at $\mathcal{H}^+$) for N larger than some threshhold value, then u is unique. Since K and s are arbitrary, this implies the existence of a solution u such that

$$u \in \rho^N L^2((0,\delta); C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^2)) \cap \mathcal{D}'_m(X \setminus \overline{X}_+)$$

for each N. The smoothness of u in the ρ variable now follows from the usual "partial hypoellipticity at the boundary" argument (using the high order of vanishing of u and f to account for the derivatives in the ρ variable which degenerate at the boundary), see [34, Theorem B.2.9]. □

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Maciej Zworski for his encouragement and numerous helpful conversations. I am especially grateful to Semyon Dyatlov and Peter Hintz for illuminating discussions on the finer points of microlocal analysis on black hole backgrounds

and for their continued interest in the problem. Finally, I would like to thank Andras Vasy for clarifying the applicability of his results in [42] to the case of Kerr–AdS metrics.

References

[1] S. J. Avis, C. J. Isham, and D. Storey. Quantum field theory in anti-de sitter space-time. *Phys. Rev. D*, 18:3565–3576, Nov 1978.

[2] A. Bachelot. Gravitational scattering of electromagnetic field by schwarzschild black-hole. *Annales de l'institut Henri Poincaré (A) Physique théorique*, 54(3):261–320, 1991.

[3] A. Bachelot and A. Motet-Bachelot. Les résonances d'un trou noir de Schwarzschild. *Annales de l'institut Henri Poincaré (A) Physique théorique*, 59(1):3–68, 1993.

[4] Venkat Balasubramanian, Alex Buchel, Stephen R Green, Luis Lehner, and Steven L Liebling. Holographic thermalization, stability of anti–de sitter space, and the fermi-pasta-ulam paradox. *Physical review letters*, 113(7):071601, 2014.

[5] M. Berkooz, A. Sever, and A. Shomer. 'Double trace' deformations, boundary conditions and space-time singularities. *JHEP*, 0205:034, 2002.

[6] P. Bizoń. Is AdS stable? *Gen.Rel.Grav.*, 46(5):1724, 2014.

[7] P. Bizoń and A. Rostworowski. Weakly turbulent instability of anti de sitter spacetime. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107:031102, Jul 2011.

[8] Piotr Bizoń, Maciej Maliborski, and Andrzej Rostworowski. Resonant dynamics and the instability of anti–de sitter spacetime. *Physical review letters*, 115(8):081103, 2015.

[9] J.-F. Bony and D. Häfner. Decay and non-decay of the local energy for the wave equation on the de sitterschwarzschild metric. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 282(3):697–719, 2008.

[10] P. Breitenlohner and D.Z. Freedman. Positive Energy in anti-De Sitter Backgrounds and Gauged Extended Supergravity. *Phys. Lett.*, B115:197, 1982.

[11] P. Breitenlohner and D.Z Freedman. Stability in gauged extended supergravity. *Annals of Physics*, 144(2):249 – 281, 1982.

[12] Alex Buchel, Stephen R Green, Luis Lehner, and Steven L Liebling. Conserved quantities and dual turbulent cascades in anti–de sitter spacetime. *Physical Review D*, 91(6):064026, 2015.

[13] V Cardoso, Ó.J.C. Dias, G.S. Hartnett, L. Lehner, and J.E. Santos. Holographic thermalization, quasinormal modes and superradiance in kerr-ads. *JHEP*, 1404:183, 2014.

[14] Ó.J.C. Dias, G.T. Horowitz, D. Marolf, and J.E. Santos. On the nonlinear stability of asymptotically anti-de sitter solutions. *Class.Quant.Grav.*, 29:235019, 2012.

[15] Ó.J.C Dias, G.T. Horowitz, and J.E. Santos. Gravitational turbulent instability of anti-de sitter space. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 29(19):194002, 2012.

[16] Ó.J.C. Dias and J.E. Santos. Boundary conditions for kerr-ads perturbations. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2013(10), 2013.

[17] M. Dimassi and J. Sjostrand. *Spectral Asymptotics in the Semi-Classical Limit*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1999.

[18] S. Dyatlov. Quasi-Normal Modes and Exponential Energy Decay for the Kerr-de Sitter Black Hole. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 306:119–163, August 2011.

[19] S. Dyatlov. Asymptotic Distribution of Quasi-Normal Modes for Kerr-de Sitter Black Holes. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 13(5):1101–1166, 2012.

[20] S. Dyatlov and M. Zworski. Mathematical theory of scattering resonances.

[21] Semyon Dyatlov and Maciej Zworski. Dynamical zeta functions for anosov flows via microlocal analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.4203*, 2013.

[22] O. Gannot. Quasinormal modes for Schwarzschild-AdS black holes: Exponential convergence to the real axis. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 330(2):771–799, 2014.

[23] O. Gannot. Elliptic boundary value problems for Bessel operators, with applications to anti-de Sitter spacetimes. July 2015. arXiv:1507.02794.

[24] M. Giammatteo and I.G. Moss. Gravitational quasinormal modes for kerr anti-de sitter black holes. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 22(9):1803, 2005.

[25] Gerd Grubb. Pseudo-differential boundary problems in lp, spaces. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 15(3):289–340, 1990.

[26] C. Guillarmou. Meromorphic properties of the resolvent on asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds. *Duke Math. J.*, 129(1):1–37, 07 2005.

[27] S.W. Hawking, C.J. Hunter, and M. Taylor. Rotation and the AdS / CFT correspondence. *Phys.Rev.*, D59:064005, 1999.

[28] Peter Hintz and András Vasy. Asymptotics for the wave equation on differential forms on kerr-de sitter space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.03179*, 2015.

[29] G. Holzegel, J. Luk, J. Smulevici, and C. Warnick. Asymptotic properties of linear field equations in anti-de Sitter space. 2015.

[30] G. Holzegel and J. Smulevici. Decay properties of klein-gordon fields on kerr-ads spacetimes. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 66(11):1751–1802, 2013.

[31] G. Holzegel and J. Smulevici. Stability of schwarzschild-ads for the spherically symmetric einstein-klein-gordon system. *Commun.Math.Phys.*, 317:205–251, 2013.

[32] G. Holzegel and J. Smulevici. Quasimodes and a lower bound on the uniform energy decay rate for kerr–ads spacetimes. *Analysis & PDE*, 7(5):1057–1090, 2014.

[33] G.H. Holzegel and C.M. Warnick. Boundedness and growth for the massive wave equation on asymptotically anti-de Sitter black holes. 2012.

[34] L. Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators III: Pseudo-Differential Operators*. A Series of Comprehensive Studies in Mathematics / Grundlehren Der Mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.

[35] G.T. Horowitz and V.E. Hubeny. Quasinormal modes of ads black holes and the approach to thermal equilibrium. *Phys. Rev. D*, 62:024027, Jun 2000.

[36] A. Ishibashi and R.M. Wald. Dynamics in nonglobally hyperbolic static space-times. 3. Anti-de Sitter space-time. *Class.Quant.Grav.*, 21:2981–3014, 2004.

[37] R. A. Konoplya and A. Zhidenko. Quasinormal modes of black holes: From astrophysics to string theory. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 83:793–836, Jul 2011.

[38] A. Martinez. *An Introduction to Semiclassical and Microlocal Analysis*. CMS Books in Mathematics. Springer, 2002.

[39] R.B Melrose. Spectral and scattering theory for the laplacian on asymptotically euclidian spaces. *Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, pages 85–85, 1994.

[40] F.W.J. Olver. *Introduction to Asymptotics and Special Functions*. Elsevier Science, 2014.

[41] A. Sá Barreto and M. Zworski. Distribution of resonances for spherical black holes. *Math. Res. Lett*, 1997.

[42] A. Vasy. Microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic and kerr-de sitter spaces (with an appendix by semyon dyatlov). *Inventiones mathematicae*, 194(2):381–513, 2013.

[43] A. Vasy. Microlocal analysis of asymptotically hyperbolic spaces and high energy resolvent estimates. In G. Uhlmann, editor, *Inverse Problems and Applications: Inside Out II*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
[44] András Vasy. The wave equation on asymptotically de sitter-like spaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 223(1):49–97, 2010.
[45] C. M. Warnick. The Massive Wave Equation in Asymptotically AdS Spacetimes. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 321(1):85–111, May 2013.
[46] C.M. Warnick. On quasinormal modes of asymptotically anti-de sitter black holes. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 333(2):959–1035, 2015.
[47] E. Witten. Anti-de Sitter space and holography. *Adv.Theor.Math.Phys.*, 2:253–291, 1998.
[48] E. Witten. Multitrace operators, boundary conditions, and ads / cft correspondence. 2001.
[49] M. Zworski. *Semiclassical Analysis*. Graduate studies in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2012.
[50] Maciej Zworski. Resonances for asymptotically hyperbolic manifolds: Vasy's method revisited. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.03352*, 2015.

E-mail address: ogannot@math.berkeley.edu

Department of Mathematics, Evans Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA